DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 353 EA 002 898

AUTHOR Leeper, Robert R., Ed.
TITLE Changing Supervision for Changing Times.
INSTITUTION Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 69p.; Speeches given before the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference (24th, Chicago, Illinois, March 16-20, 1969)
AVAILABLE FROM Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (NEA, Stock No. 611-17802, $2.00)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Ancillary Services, Communication Problems, Professional Services, Relevance (Education), *Resource Staff Role, *Social Change, *Supervision, *Supervisors, Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

This collection of four addresses considers some important issues for educational supervisors in a society undergoing rapid social changes. Jacqueline Grennan Wexler suggests that open communication in a climate of mutual independence and responsibility among educational administrators, students, teachers, and taxpayers is a possible solution to turmoil in contemporary education. Harry S. Broudy treats the school as a social system and outlines three major areas of stress in contemporary education: teachers vs taxpayers, black vs white cultures, and students vs administrators. Richard L. Foster challenges supervisors to be leaders of educational revolts by proposing new curricula and methods of school organization to make educational institutions relevant to contemporary problems. Muriel Crosby chides supervisors for failing to accept responsibility in the leadership of their own profession, and recommends the professionalization of supervision by establishing a body of theory and practice pertinent to that field. (RA)

ED041353

Changing Supervision for Changing Times

Addresses for the
24th Annual Conference
Chicago, Illinois
March 16-20, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Edited by Robert R. Leeper

EA 002 898

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

Copyright © 1969 by the
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Price: $2.00
NEA Stock Number: 611-17802

The materials printed herein are the expressions of the writers. They do not represent endorsement by, nor a statement of policy of, the Association.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-94555

Contents

iv Acknowledgments

v Foreword
Alexander Frazier

1 Educational Realities—A Perspective
Jacqueline Grennan Wexler

13 The School as a Social System: Stress and Distress
Harry S. Broudy

31 Educational Supervision: Dead or Alive?
Richard L. Foster

43 The New Supervisor: Caring, Coping, Becoming
Muriel Crosby

65 Contributors

Acknowledgments

FINAL editing of the manuscript and production of this booklet were the responsibility of Robert R. Leeper, Associate Secretary and Editor, ASCD Publications. Technical production was handled by Mary Albert O'Neill, Lana G. Pipes, Nancy Olson, and Karen T. Brakke.

Foreword

IN A most literal sense, this collection of papers prepared for the Chicago conference stands as a tribute to the leadership of Muriel Crosby in helping the Association assume a more active role in responding to the needs of school supervisors. The theme for the conference was proposed by her. Her own contribution to this collection includes not only an analysis of how our magazine has dealt with the concerns of supervisors but also her thoughtful proposals for new directions to be pursued by the Association.

Persons who attended the Chicago conference will welcome the opportunity to check back on their recollections of the papers presented by Jacqueline Grennan Wexler, Harry S. Broudy, and Richard L. Foster. Newcomers to the papers will find among them a stimulating variety of notions about the nature of supervision. They will also be struck, as I have been on rereading the papers, by the sense of urgency that runs through them all.

Thanks must go to Robert R. Leeper and his competent staff for their services in preparing the manuscript for publication and seeing it through the press.

ALEXANDER FRAZIER
President 1969-70
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development, NEA

Educational Realities — A Perspective

JACQUELINE GRENNAN WEXLER

CHARLES DICKENS could not foresee the twentieth century when he described his own as "the best of times and the worst of times." Certainly every educator from preschool through graduate school must embrace this current state of the nation with both seriousness and a sense of humor if he is to survive and if our formal system of education is to endure in any form. Probably at no time in the history of the world has so much been expected, indeed even demanded, of our schools. Ironically, at the same time, the schools at every level are being condemned for their past and present inabilities to cope with the complex problems of our times.

For the first time in the history of this nation, the ideal of universal education from preschool through some form of "secondary" education has become part of the rising expectations of every segment of the American society. Students, parents, employers, and political pressure groups are all calling for relevance: relevance to the problems of local situations; relevance to world political realities; relevance to temporary jobs and to permanent professions; relevance to aesthetics and morality and complicated life styles. The demand of any particular established or instant lobby group is often in direct conflict with that of another group in the same school constituency. In one very real sense, Brownsville and San Francisco State have become the political pawn of multiple players in a new and complex game.

Toward an Open Society

Let us look briefly at the historical pattern of our school structures in light of the present turmoil.

The elementary and secondary school system of the United

States was conceived and nurtured as a local responsibility with local control. State and regional accrediting institutions gradually evolved to ensure a rising level of professionalism by demanding minimum requirements for teacher certification and school standards. Still, for almost a century, from 1850 until 1950, the schools remained largely the creatures and the possessions of fundamentally closed societies. In any closed society, I submit, the expectancy behavior demands are thoroughly predictable. My own was the demand of a parochial Roman Catholic environment. Yours may have been the demands of a parochial Bible-belt fundamentalism, of a Jewish ghettoism, or of a smug atheism. Whatever they were, they provided for us a degree of comforting support by the very fact of the closed system. Where the student possesses this kind of comforting support, teachers and administrators living largely within the same concepts have a relatively easy job.

It is obvious that we no longer live in this kind of static, "closed society." Transportation and communication and the open and instant press have broken the barriers of all localism and opened the flood gates of conflicting ideologies and emerging world views. Almost four years ago in a speech at a meeting of the American Council on Education I developed this theme:

> The system of higher education beginning to open itself to all social, economic, national, religious, racial groups will experience with growing intensity this simulation and disorder of this ecumenical searching. The social and philosophical and religious and moral systems will be subject to the personal pressure and cross pressure of persons interacting in an open society. Students in such an open society within a college or university are not likely to allow the college or university to remain segregated from the real issues of Vietnam and Vatican II, of Watts and India. For the world of open communications reaches into the ivory tower, the fraternity house, and the sanctuary, and asks the ivory tower, the fraternity house, and the sanctuary to respond to the real world.

I am sure I could not at that time have predicted the speed and force with which the campus revolution would be upon us. However, anyone who has lived through a personal reorganization of his own philosophical, ethical, religious, and socioeconomic views as he confronts varied and conflicting evidence must face clearly the inevitable anguish and chaos which our world must endure if it is to regroup itself in this kind of open and opening society.

Let me suggest that each of us who plays a role in a world of formal education today must balance humility with courage and a sense of humor with a sense of responsibility. Multiple forces in our society have begun to compete with us for the minds and hearts of the students in our public schools and in our liberal arts colleges. Multiple and conflicting teachers always make it harder for one teacher to indoctrinate a student or a group of students. For this, I say, thank God. Today, it is the whole society that educates and we are only one facet of that society.

At long last, we may be free to be honest educational institutions. Instead of indoctrinating in any closed and final way, we are almost being forced to create a system of education which values most the individual's ability to learn to learn. Preschool children get into the first grade and some of them already know how to read, and the first-grade teacher is disturbed because her lesson plan no longer works. The artifact of structure is gone, and the first-grade teacher sometimes after weeks of frustration discovers that what she really needs is the function of structuring rather than the structure of a lesson plan. Maybe on that day she has really begun to discover what education is all about, that the purpose of education is to learn to learn. Not to learn things, not to learn systems, not to learn facts, but to learn to learn: to use facts and systems and artifacts as your input to learn, to make new systems, to make new artifacts, to make new institutions, to make new worlds.

Not only the school, but every other "teaching" institution must begin to recognize its important but partial role in the educating society. The home and family, the church, the socioeconomic environment, political parties, and political pressure groups, must all begin to recognize both their complementary and competing functions in attempting to claim the minds and hearts and souls of the young people of our land. If, indeed, each of them and all of them function only as competitive forces, I submit that we will tear apart both our young people and our land.

An honest and concerned parent will be able to love his life into his child to some degree but he will not be able legally to tie that child to his church, to his own socioeconomic philosophy, or to his own personal philosophy of life. There is no way that a parent can sign a legal document and know that his child will infallibly follow the path of his desire. All in the world a parent can communicate to his son or daughter is, first of all, biological life which gives him physical existence, but then more important, the vital, human grace life of his own love and affection. I would argue that the mother and father who give love and affection with the longest loop are the mother and father who in later life have the most feedback of love and trust and loyalty from their children, because the mother and father who are really successful do not need to live through their children like puppets. They do not need their child to be a doctor because the father was a doctor, or more ironically to be a doctor because the father wasn't a doctor and wanted to be. Neither do they need for their children to be as passively submissive to majority groups because they were passively submissive to the majority group of their own time, or more ironically because they deeply resented their own submissiveness in an earlier culture.

Instead, secure parents need for their child to learn who he is or who she is, to find out not by edict but by trial and error who he or she is. Like the father of the prodigal son, secure parents must communicate to the child that they will always be at the top of the mountain waiting even when the child comes back from tending the swine. It is that kind of love and trust, from the mother and father in the family, from the faculty member, or from the college administrator, which will give to the next generation the staying power, the growing power, and the dynamic force to outstrip those of us who went before them.

An honest and concerned church will begin to realize that she educates best in the role of a good father and mother. She educates by communicating to us her trust and her love. Such a church will continue to pass on to us tradition. She will continue to pass on some of our norms and standards. She will share with us in some way what I call sacramental life. She will share with us her insights.

Yet today, the child in any family in any culture will begin to ask, "Which church gives me norms and standards?" In any poll of students on any university campus today, one would find hundreds of variations of denominations and subdenominations. The students would come from many neighborhoods each of which once had its own tribal culture. Where have the tribal cultures gone? Students in a pluralistic society are aware that one church has one particular view of a moral code on divorce and remarriage and another church has another particular view. A reformed group of one church has a somewhat qualified position about the place of the more fundamental church in that particular system. Each church keeps saying to her youth that this is *the* moral code, while the students keep having bull sessions upstairs and downstairs and outside and around. And they ask, "But how many moral codes?"

Response to Pressures

Perhaps it is naïve to assume that pressure groups representing specific socioeconomic and/or political interests are capable of either honesty or dispassionate concern in communicating their views to the young. I am not sure. At least, I would suggest, the rest of us must encourage students to respond and react to such groups with honesty and a degree of dispassionate concern. If we are to trust seemingly reliable sociological surveys, the socioeconomic environment may be educating more than all of the rest of us put together. These surveys show that there is a higher correlation in a given socioeconomic stratum among students of all nationalities, among students of all religions, than there is among any other subgroup. Where your treasure is, there is your heart also. And it may indeed be that one's socioeconomic vested interest is the most formative and the most effective stratification in the American society. It may be that the number of dollars that our fathers earn influences our judgments more than any other single factor—an important, troublesome, terrifying concept for you not to sleep on some night.

And yet it is the young of the affluent society who today are skeptical and cynical about much of the culture in which they have been nurtured and on which they depend even as they try to modify it or perhaps to destroy it.

Is it not possible that our mock-heroic concern, our passionate outrage against long hair and bare feet in the face of our continued passive acceptance of racism, economic oppression, and savage warfare, has provoked in the young a passionate mock-heroic and even verbally savage retaliation? Is it possible that they deliberately fling obscenities in the face of our preoccupation with cleanliness, propriety, and public sexual morality because they see these factors as the whited sepulchers that cover the dead-men's bones of ruthless ambition and hypocrisy?

Many of us have been quick to blanket all dissenters as traitors to their families, to their churches, and to their nation. Those of us whose lives are ostensibly committed to freedom of thought and freedom of expression have too often throttled both and then compounded our prejudgments by identifying intellectual and moral positions with the length of one's hair or the style of one's clothing. Do we not at least have to admit that adults ought not to be mock-heroic if they expect to be taken seriously?

There seems little doubt that the old notions of authority which once provided the stability of our social systems have been questioned, confronted, and substantially destroyed; the *ad hoc* communes of Haight-Ashbury and Greenwich Village have served at least as a temporary force against parental domination. Clerical and teachers' unions have assaulted the authority of bishops and school superintendents.

Parent groups and political actionists have moved against school boards and mayors and officials of the teachers' unions. Educators at all levels have joined protest movements against authorities within the school systems and against public officials in the larger political sector.

Let me say simply that I believe all of this was almost inevitable as the world society moved from the tribal closure of provincial, parochial units to the dynamism of multiple large and small units interacting in one global theatre linked by instant communications media, particularly television.

We in the field of education have, traditionally at least, paid lip service to the convention that knowledge is never dangerous. In the face of our own inability to cope with the competing ideas of instant communication, we must not chain the new bibles to the old stands.

Educational institutions have been and must continue to be the preservers of tradition and culture. Yet they cannot be "defenders of the faith" in the old sense either in the church or in the body politic. They can be citadels of tradition only if they are also citadels of dissent, centers of looking toward the future, willing to deny "truths" of the past in order to assert the emerging truths of the future.

But intellectual theories must be forged and modified and purified in the muddled, noisy, empirical world of pragmatic action. We have begun to realize the limited value of the sanctuary and of the ivory tower if their so-called inhabitants are to speak relevantly to the world of action.

Herein, it seems to me, lies the basic dilemma of the contemporary world of higher education facing all of its professional members—administrators, faculty, and students. Many administrators and faculty members have spent their entire adult lives inside the world of academia involved around the clock and around the calendar in the world of conceptual theories. Today's young people are destined to live inside this system well into their third and often fourth decade of life. Most of their grandfathers and many of their fathers were economic adults at eighteen, and were therefore accepted as adults by traditional society. A society geared toward longer and longer education, for the reasons I have already stated or for other reasons you may perceive, is forcing our eighteen- to twenty-five-year-olds to remain economically adolescents, dependent on family or university benefaction for their personal and professional livelihood.

Independence and Responsibility

This generation of students has been reared and educated in the most permissive culture our nation has ever known. Ironically, I submit, this has also been the most dependent culture our nation has ever known. Their "freedom" is dependent almost entirely on the willingness of parents and other authorities to go on supporting them. Yet parents and philanthropic granters of fellowships determine their support—understandably and perhaps rightly so—by their general approval of students' "free" choices.

I believe that it is critical that we begin immediately to make this generation of students economically independent of parents, economically independent of college administrators, economically independent of the Ford Foundation; and, in a functional way, economically independent of state and federal legislators. Whether it be guaranteed income for college students, or a massive GI bill-type subsidy for all college students, we must make them financially independent units who personally bear the consequences of their own economic decisions. I submit that unless we face this fact, we are headed for continuing anarchy, for continuing chaos. Unless we face this fact, we will continue to have to deal with students on any and all issues, and they will never have to face personally the consequences of their own decisions.

Students have seen the academic intellectuals within the faculty for the first time in history begin to have as a group a concern for social justice, to move from a purely academic, theoretical concern to the activist and even actionist concern in the tactical world of the political sector. Professors were in the early freedom rides. A few professors have been in the forefront of political and economic change in the United States. But many of those professors, often like the students themselves (and like myself) went into this social-political sector with no real background, no effective experience in decision making. We entered often from the position of armchair critics who have never played or coached the game. It is easy on a Monday morning after a famous Sunday to qualify one's opinion of Joe Namath. Even sports writers have to face their pregame judgments in the light of the game.

What I want us to consider is not only our reevaluation from the armchair, but our deeper realization that the armchair is ***not*** the game, that none of us even now has the experience of Joe Namath or the coach of the Baltimore Colts. None of us was facing each individual player in the game, forced to make decisions that could not be made again, but only modified as the game went on. The Baltimore Colts—and the sportswriters—cannot modify what they did until next year and then will never modify what they did but only what they are going to do in the light of that Sunday afternoon.

It seems to me that a college president, or a conceptual planner for Monsanto, or a bishop of a diocese, or a President of the United States, or a man in the U.N. is always in this position. In some ways, so are the students. Unless they have the experience of living with the consequences of decisions they make (not merely the review and protest of the consequences of the decisions board members make or presidents make or faculty committees make), unless we continue to find ways that they can make decisions and can live in concrete areas with the consequences of those decisions, many of them will, I believe, become more and more naïve, more and more arrogant, and more and more unable to live within themselves. They will continue to carry placards about the Vietnam war, about investment portfolios in South Africa, and about instant changes in the curriculum. And many of them will not even know whether or not the placards they are carrying have been well thought out. They may quickly decide to carry a new kind of placard tomorrow. Most of them do not really believe that we are going to let them into the decision-making process.

I held a meeting with a militant group in great controversy in the college in December. I wanted them to elect two students to a committee which was going to interview a person for a job. They refused out-of-hand to join the committee, and they were honest. They said that the reason they wanted to stay off the committee was that they wanted to stay in a position of being able to ride the guy out on the rails two months from now if they did not like him.

And that to me is the heart of the question. I would say, at the point of being ridden out on the rails myself, that I will not willingly yield to them that kind of freedom, because it is fascist. Should I yield to them a freedom in which they have no responsibility in making a decision, but in which they make me play the queen of hearts by chopping off the head of anyone they might be against momentarily? If we do so, we violate human rights at the deepest level. And we simply invert, it seems to me, the mistake of the unfinished business of centuries. Instead of an autocrat at the top arbitrarily telling everybody what to do, we permit any instant group, self-established as a plebiscite democracy, to turn the authority figure into a fascist, this time into a fascist rubber stamp: a fascist rubber stamp that can intervene and do away with the due process of law. This, I believe, is the most critical dilemma we are facing in higher education and in the body politic in our world today.

Social Justice

The question haunting society is whether or not the individual at all controls his own destiny. The father thought to be most conservative by his daughter or son asks that question all the time. The long beard or the clean-shaven asks that question as it relates to him personally. Each of us wants to have some control over, not *our* destiny, but *my* destiny. Each of us is self-interested in a lovely and beautiful and real way. But where do we get control over our own destiny in a world that is going to have to get bigger and bigger, more and more bureaucratic? If there is any hope at all that the world community includes a North and South Vietnam and Biafra, as well as Webster Groves and Paris, then there is only a *world* community coming somewhere, a world government coming somewhere. Even the unfinished business of the United States was to make a little world community out of a lot of fractured communities. And we do have a big bureaucracy because we do not have a lot of fractured states.

I know that the radical groups in all our institutions today are very concerned that they assert their new kind of social justice tomorrow. But, if that is possible, then it becomes possible also for others to assert what they see as their kind of social justice tomorrow. The world was open to Joe McCarthy and "Bull" Conner and will be again if it is open to the fascist left. It is this that I think we have to communicate. I do not think we will communicate it by speeches very much at all.

The student newspaper a couple of weeks ago said that not many students at Webster College are affected by Miss Grennan's rhetoric. I think I knew that long before they did. Rhetoric at best can be a description of one's own experience, a limited attempt to describe to somebody in a verbal communication where we stand as a result of experience. No student can believe or disbelieve what I believe in any way, unless he or she has had the opportunity and the necessity to face something like the same sets of decisions, not the same decisions, but the kinds of decisions that I have had to make. And so we are indulging in pure rhetoric unless we are all the time trying to maneuver the situation, not to create the thing they must do, but to create a situation in which *they* must decide what to do, and in which they must live with the consequences of what they do. Unless this is possible, our rhetoric is indeed sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Our rhetoric at best can be only a filter through which they say at some time, "My God, maybe that is what she meant." I know that that is what I have been doing at the best moments of my own life. The old joke, "It's amazing how bright Dad has gotten in the last five years," like many homely truths, has an important insight in it. The experience we are getting is being used against a filter.

It is because I believe one must learn to make decisions by making decisions, the consequences of which one must personally bear, that I will fight to the death against a town-meeting approach in running a college or running a country. A town meeting on every issue turns us all by majority vote into a new military logistic. More and more I would like to see us work out ways that the decisions affecting groups of people be made by the smallest number possible. As often as possible I would like to see that number be *one*. I have been arguing for many years against the notion of a college or university as a closed, self-contained community. No student's life should be lived under my domination. As soon as I say that, students begin protesting that I deliver tomorrow. Instead I have said, "Let us open the question, let us see whether we can help in our years to design a community in which it is possible for students to have options." There is nowhere else in the world except the school where a young person or old person lives under one authority.

We made a first step this semester by breaking the compulsory food package for resident students. I meet students in the grocery store now shopping with a real sense of economy. They tell me that it is amazing how many things you can warm up and how many things are not so expensive. The seniors coming to my house for dinner this semester announce that they really look forward to the assurance of something other than hamburgers for the fifth day this week. But the only alternative we gave them before, in what we call a learning situation, was to walk through the cafeteria door and to condemn us if we did not give them more than three good choices in the 20 meals we required them to eat in our cafeteria. They had nothing to live with but the food manager's choices. And so their only choice was to protest against someone else.

Our students grew up in a generation in which they drove cars legally at sixteen. This, if nothing else, gave them privacy, total privacy, and we are fools if we don't realize that fact. And still, even in our colleges and universities, we try to manufacture worlds in which we supervise their so-called privacy, and they do not have to face their own decisions in determining their moral codes. They can focus so much of their energy on whether or not they are beating *our* system (even as they are rebelling against our system) that they never have to face or evaluate their own moral choices. We keep meeting their demands about parietals instead of releasing them to a plurality of choices in making lease arrangements for their own housing.

I do not at all think these kinds of things can be done overnight. Yet I think we have to begin to distribute decision making. Even our faculty is beginning to be convinced that money that is spent on one thing cannot be spent on another. They are even beginning to realize that small classes probably mean lower salaries, and they have got to decide which priority is more critical for quality teaching and learning. Decisions that involve certain people have got to be made intensely by those people. Let me indulge in passionate rhetoric, if only as a possible echoing filter for you. When students or faculty are protesting for the right to enter superficially into every decision, that means that anybody has the right to enter into or intervene in their decisions and to control their lives. In such a system, every aspect of one's world is always a compromise.

A Choice Among Alternatives

Rather, I am convinced, personal freedom is dependent on a choice among alternatives. The best we can do is to multiply the alternatives. But let us remember (those of us who can remember, even as young, young people) the days of Joe McCarthy. And let us remember how close the world of higher education came to losing academic freedom and the due process of law. Let us be aware of the Congressional Committee inquiry that has no respect for the due process which is a characteristic of the legal procedure in the United States, unfinished as it is, imperfect as it is. If we rob another man of due process of law, be he professor, student, president, trustee, governor, or Pope, we are helping to create a world which opens the intellectual and social gate for that to happen to us. I think somehow we have got to get this into our bloodstream if we are to understand what is happening in higher education today.

I have the utmost sympathy for students. We have lived through a history of education in which children were seen and not heard, in which some legislators and some editorial writers are still saying: "You knew what your school was before you came here.

Take your school as a package or take nothing at all." I reject that notion. That implies that schools are not *learning* institutions themselves. If indeed a school is a package at any time, it defies the very thing it says it is going to be, namely a learning institution. I have said, and I will continue to say, that I have got to listen to what many people say; that I have got to listen to the twenty-year-olds, because my memory is very short, and because when I was 20 the world was not like it is today.

But they also have to listen to me. They must at least consider that you and I have to make some decisions after having listened to them and to many other vested-interest views. Those decisions cannot be the fascist determination made by the intervention of one group that seizes power. If they are, we have moved, in my estimation, to a very retrogressive posture in the world. I started to say this two years ago at a National Students Association meeting in Maryland. I was, to my great amazement, called by some a first cousin of Ronald Reagan.

At this point I think we must stand up and be counted. I believe that those of us who have fostered the permissive generation, those of us who have fostered the voice of the students, must not, out of a kind of fear that they call us the wrong names, must not now yield to a coddling of that generation by refusing to fight back. If, indeed, the new generation are peers of the rest of us in any way, they are really peers. One of the reasons that I so enjoy the Board of Directors of Webster College is that they treat me as a peer. They treat me as a peer by giving me the hardest time imaginable. And I know day after day, month after month, and I think year after year, that their respect for me is almost in direct proportion to the hard time they give me, because they think that will hone my mind and that I am capable of taking it. If students and faculty members believe (and I believe they do) that they are now capable of sharing in that kind of dialogue, I will prove to them that I believe in it by engaging in that kind of dialogue with them. They may in answer forcefully ride us out on the rails or cause more heart attacks among presidents, superintendents, and principals, but mutual respect implies that we both respect our mutual rights to tell it like it is.

Your program committee assigned to me the title "Educational Realities—A Perspective." Perhaps reality is always messy, always frustrating because we live so in the midst of it. Once we were all too prone to endure the now as a vale of tears which would earn for us a glorious hereafter. Instead, it now seems possible to live intensely in the noisy, frustrating *now,* knowing that our actions are in some way eternal inasmuch as they in any way help make the future.

The School as a Social System: Stress and Distress

HARRY S. BROUDY

SINCE I last spoke at an ASCD general session (1966) there have been many realignments in the battle for the control of the schools, the public schools especially, but now also the colleges and the universities. My colleagues reproach me for using the adversarial language of war and remind me that we are all working for school improvement; that cooperation not confrontation is the road to salvation. I regret having to disagree with these views, not because I favor conflict over peace, but because the conditions for genuine cooperation have not yet been achieved. Nor will they be achieved until all parties respect each other's motives and competence, so that the collaboration will be between equals and not a euphemism for domination of one side by the other.

Much as we all like to keep discussion on a high plane of principle—above personalities and politics—it is simply naïve not to take account of who is appointed to panels in the U.S. Office of Education; who is invited to important conferences; who gets which grants —in short, who distributes the money and prestige rewards in the educational sweepstakes. Naïveté is not idealism. I believe any dispassionate examination will support the hypothesis that since 1957 two Establishments have been contending for the control of schools. One is the Carnegie-Ford-U.S.O.E.-Industry-Liberal Arts coalition (the New Establishment), and the other has been made up of professional organizations of public school personnel and the teacher-training faculties in colleges of education (the Old Establishment).

Until the early 'sixties the New Establishment mounted its attack in the name of excellence as defined by professors of the academic disciplines. Curriculum, teacher training, and school organization were all judged by this standard. Thereafter, Washington and the nation were made aware of the poverty problem, the race problem, and the large overlap between the two. Inasmuch as the U.S. economy could not tolerate sizable pockets of underconsumption if it were to maintain its growth rate, the problem of the disadvantaged rose in our list of priorities about as rapidly as did the war in Vietnam. These twin miseries ignited riots both in the ghettos and on college campuses.

Educationally, the gross effect of the new orientation was to put a crimp in the New Establishment's pitch for academic excellence. A demand that the school concern itself, for example, with environmental factors in development, personal relationships, and concrete problems rather than abstract learnings was heard throughout the land. The New Establishment rediscovered Progressive Education, but was spared embarrassment by the fact that so many of its bright young men thought they invented it. With fine disregard for historical fact, it now blamed the Old Establishment for blocking a return to the child-centered, socially sensitive school. Only people trained in the Peace Corps and college activists could effect the second revolution in the schools.

Although the older battles about curricula and methods continue, the battle lines are drawn somewhat differently. Today the crucial confrontations are between the taxpayers and the public school teachers; between the separatists and our pattern of school organization developed over the past 100 years; between students and the administrations of high schools and colleges. Such shifts place upon members of the total system and its subsystems the task of redefining their roles and loyalties and of integrating them into some sort of commitment. The ordinary stresses of being part of a system and of many subsystems turn into distress when the roles are shifting and the course of commitment is unclear.

Systems, Social Systems, School as a Social System

The main purpose of this paper is to share some observations and a few speculations about the stresses within the school as a social system, between it and some other systems, and their possible outcomes.

A system is an arrangement of elements in some intelligible scheme. In a *social* system the elements are human individuals or groups of them. Presumably their goals serve to organize the elements. Parents, teachers, pupils, school boards, and custodians are each assigned a role which corresponds to a status or position within the totality of processes and things that comprise the school as a system.

Social organization becomes more and more mandatory as the elements and their relationships become more dense and more tightly interdependent. For example, in a small community, air pollution could be stopped by putting a few offenders in jail; in the megalopolis, air pollution involves everybody from a cigaret smoker to the steel maker. Very few problems nowadays fail to reach the Congress of the United States, because so few of them can be dealt with on any narrower scale. Of primary importance in trying to understand a system is the spotting of the positions at which decisions that move the system in one direction or another or produce changes within the system are made.

The efficiency of a system depends on the division of labor and coordination of laborers. In a social system the division of labor runs afoul of the fact that the ultimate units of the system—persons—resist being split up into specialized roles. Teachers, administrators, and pupils at one time or another all want to be regarded as persons, not merely as functionaries within a system. Teachers want to be consumers and family members; pupils think there is more to life than study; parents want their offspring to be treated as unique individuals; and administrators are torn in many directions by their simultaneous loyalties to teachers, pupils, taxpayers, industry, government, and their own careers.

Social organizations develop a *formal* system which defines divisions of labor, lines of authority, and rules of procedure that cover all conceived contingencies; the duties and rights of boards of education, principals, teachers, pupils, taxpayers, and legislatures are set forth and wholly or partially institutionalized by constitutions, charters, and laws. Because of the multiple roles people play in the system, an *operating* system of power, authority, and ways of gettings things done comes into being. The operating system only roughly corresponds to the formal one.

At any time the formal system can be invoked by one or more of the parties to regulate the operational system, and the operational system can be used to subvert or disrupt the formal one. This has given rise, as we now know so well, to such moral questions as these: Is it ever right for people to flout the formal rules of a system? Is it right to interpose formal rules when members of the system believe they are being unjustly treated by these rules? Are these rules right in themselves, or are they justified by the needs of the people concerned? Are they right in some transcultural sense, or are they devices used by the people in power to preserve their advantages in a particular situation? Thus the stress between the formal and operational systems can turn into a source of distress.

I shall only mention some of the attempts to use systems to understand and control social behavior. School administrators now regard systems theory as an important part of learning how to manage the personnel within their school systems. Hints have been eagerly received from group dynamics, especially from the interaction patterns within small groups. The trick, of course, is to preserve some semblance of personhood in a system which has, on occasion, to regard its units as nonpersons. Subtle psychological self-examination, role playing, sensitivity training, are all designed to help turn the trick—all of which is summed up in that vague and somewhat awkward phrase "relating to people."[1]

Another gambit is to think of the system as a network of communications. All troubles are then diagnosed as a failure in communications, and the remedy is more and better communications. This and other benign theories assume that deep down everybody in the system has the same interests and desires, and if only this can be brought to consciousness, the group would arrive at what Professor R. Bruce Raup has so aptly christened the community of uncoerced persuasion. The confrontations now besetting our society call this assumption itself into question. Representative democracy unfortunately works only so long as everybody involved believes in it.

More Machiavellian and Marxist interpretations of systems take economic or political power as the key principle. The various persons in a system belong to classes that either have power or would like to get it away from those who do have it. A Machiavellian would say that the elites holding power are ready to use whatever means are necessary to keep it. A Marxist would say that control of the means of production is the key principle, and that inevitably the exploited class (the proletariat) will unite to overthrow the exploiters (capitalists) and restore justice and equality in the distribution of goods and services.

In either analysis, "right" and "good" are what serve a group's interests. Fair and right in this game is whatever gives advantage, and all appeal to a higher morality or law is to be construed as part of the game—another counter that helps rally support of the people who are gulled into believing that such appeals are somehow valid. Both analyses come out at about the same principle: Might is the only right, and the first political commandment is: Get power first and bargain later.

---

[1] For a recent example see: Rensis Likert. *The Human Organization, Its Management and Value.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Still another approach to the study of systems is systems analysis. If the state of a system is the result of a number of variables operating in relation to each other, if we could give a value to every variable at any given moment, and if we knew how the variables were correlated to each other, then we could predict: (a) the effect of what a change in any variable would do to others and (b) the response of the system as a whole to a change in any or all of the variables.

Such knowledge, of course, would be of enormous value for social planning and control. It has been put to use in studies of war and weaponry as a means of planning national and global strategy. With the help of computers that make the handling of numerous variables practicable, systems analysis may enable us to plan and control our economic system and perhaps education as well. All of this is social engineering, and although it rubs most of us the wrong way to be so manipulable, we in education would be well advised not to underestimate the importance of long-range planning.

For example, the cost efficiency approach which the former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara instituted in the Defense Department is being urged on education. The proposed schemes for national assessment, whatever merits they may have, will be used to measure the efficiency of the money input into schools and the consequent output per dollar. There are many reasons for doubting that this approach will work very well in education, some of which reasons I shall touch upon a little later. Nonetheless, just because education is a subsystem in the total social system, whatever happens in industry and defense and anywhere else, for that matter, will have an educational exponent. Yet educators are told about the school's assignment long after other agencies have done their planning and made their decisions.

The schools are urged to do their part and are beaten over the head for footdragging, conservatism, and sheer incompetence, when in many instances it would take a full educational generation (12-14 years) to bring about the desired changes. Because education requires a long lead time to effect important changes, any systems analysis that forecasts with some plausibility social demands on the schools 20 years ahead would be of enormous value. Unfortunately, educators are not usually invited to the conferences that do the important planning in our country, or if some are, they are not always the men who understand or can do very much about the public schools as a system. Accordingly, while we may properly withhold our endorsement from inept cost-efficiency applications to education and from ill-conceived pressures to accelerate innovations, we should be supportive of educational futurism.[2]

A word needs to be said about bureaucracy. This is a bad word, but it is the name of a very important and necessary feature of a complex social system. A social system is often run by officials of one kind or another having a more or less continuous tenure. They make a career of working in the system, studying it, and perfecting it. For them it tends to become an end in itself, although members of one bureaucracy do not hold so lofty a view about other bureaucracies.

Against bureaucracy the general accusation is that it is over-formal, over-legalistic, over-concerned with procedural propriety and very much over-concerned with maintaining itself, come what may. Another word for a large pervasive bureaucracy is the Establishment. We hear much about Establishments and the evils they perpetuate. In the nature of the case the Establishment is conservative for it has something to conserve, including its command of prestige and power, and it is defensive because to individuals in their predicaments the rigidity and impersonality of the Establishment are offensive and hateful. The attempts to render bureaucracies non-bureaucratic are destined to continue—and to continue to fail.

I shall use some of these remarks about the nature of notions about the systems to explicate the three areas of confrontation or distress that now characterize the shifts within the system and with the system of systems that constitutes the social order.

Teachers vs. Taxpayers

We are in the midst of a revolt of taxpayers against further increases in expenditures for schools. Tax levy and bond issue referenda are being defeated with alarming frequency. The drain on real estate taxes is one reason often mentioned; resistance to liberal tendencies in the schools is another; symbolic protest against racial integration of the schools is still another. Because so large a proportion of school expenditures is for teachers' salaries (estimated at 60 percent), teachers have most to lose from the tax rebellion.

Teachers have responded by organizing for collective negotiations and for applying possible sanctions, including strikes. These actions have been defended as necessary to preserve the public school system, to improve the schools, and to protect the professional status of the teacher. The school boards, usually with the aid of the administration, have often countered by invoking the formal procedures of the system. The union has responded, in turn, by saying that the strike or threat of a strike is the only way left to force the bureaucracy and the public to face the issues.

---

[2] Some educators have already treated this, for example, Professor and Mrs. Harold G. Shane at Indiana University, and Professor William Van Til at Indiana State University.

Without questioning the sincerity of either side or the justice of their respective claims, it may be noted that teacher strikes are rarely staged solely to improve the schools or the status of the profession. Usually there is also a demand for more money or better working conditions or, as in the recent New York City strike, for maintaining the hard-won powers of the union and the tenure of its members. On the other side, school boards rarely pay more than they must.

Administrators are clearly being challenged in their claims to represent the teachers, the public, or the school as a social institution. The teacher organization can do better by negotiating directly with the revenue sources—the school board, the state legislature, or even the governor. School administrators are now being forced into the role of financial, managerial experts whose influence on policy is indirect and covert, much as is the influence of the city manager.

The current militance of teachers is to a large extent part of a general demand of service workers for a larger share of the general affluence. Firemen, policemen, transit workers, garbage collectors, and hospital employees are all threatening to withhold their indispensable social services in order to achieve economic gains that industrial employees have achieved by collective action, and which self-employed professionals have achieved by agreement, tacit or explicit.

Frequently we hear that the demand of the schools for more money, and especially the demands of teachers for higher wages, is not warranted by improved results. For example, in a discussion on ghetto problems of education both Kenneth Clark and the late Robert Kennedy voiced the view that the public has a right to see improved results in the schools for increased expenditures.[3] Professor Clark noted that despite the extraordinary increases for school expenditures in the city of New York during the last decade, no corresponding increases in efficiency had occurred.

Let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that both Clark

[3] *The Center Magazine,* Volume 7, Number 1, November 1967.

and Kennedy are right, and that there is no increased efficiency. Perhaps there is even a loss of efficiency. What the argument overlooks is that teachers in pressing for higher wages are not alone in being unable to justify the demand in terms of increased productivity. Barbers, lawyers, and doctors are not giving more or better service in proportion to the increase of their fees. In a few areas increased productivity has lowered the real cost of a product, for example, mass-produced products, electricity, and perhaps telephone service, but where personal service is the principal contribution of a calling, increased cost of living, rather than productivity and efficiency, is the chief factor in the price paid for it.

It is interesting to speculate on the effects of a prolonged unwillingness of the public to meet the financial demands of the schools. If salaries do constitute the major item of expenditure, and if the labor market continues to be tight, then we can expect many teachers and prospective teachers to move into other fields. The very lack of specificity in the training of teachers makes this quite possible. Their places might be taken by teachers' aides, gifted amateurs, college activists, and matrons no longer kept at home by young children. This solution seems to be devoutly hoped for by segments of the New Establishment and by the separatist groups that favor autonomy for neighborhood schools. This, of course, is a vain hope and when regarded in terms of the size of the national teacher force, a silly one as well.

More and more frequently one hears of another possibility. It is to combine public control of the schools with private operation of them. Under one variation of this scheme, a school board would contract with a private firm to provide school services for its community. Either all of the services would be handed over to the lowest bidder, or several private firms would be permitted to provide schools that would meet the requirements of the board. The model for this is the kind of contracting the U.S. Office of Education has done with some of the new educational industries. The big advantage claimed for this move is that the more efficient schools would prosper and the less efficient would not. Also, it is argued, parents by having a choice would force the public schools to improve or quit.

Such a development would, of course, give teachers another kind of employer, but whether they would abandon collective negotiations with these employers is doubtful, especially since in the competition for efficiency, teachers' wages would be the most likely source of savings. Attractive as this notion may be, the efficiency record of government contracting even with producers of hardware is not encouraging. What bargains companies would concoct for the edification of economy-minded school boards! But the most discouraging prognosis for this notion is that we do not know what efficiency means in a school system, and no really viable way of even defining this is in sight.

A more realistic response to diminished support would be the use of technology to reduce the length and theoretical level of teacher training, and to gain some of the advantages of mass operation, that is, to increase the productivity of the individual classroom worker.

Without going into details explicated elsewhere[4] it may well be that computer-aided instruction in highly improved form could take over all didactics, that is, the instruction in all components of the curriculum that can be made explicit and therefore can be programmed. This includes instruction in all the symbolic skills, systematic bodies of knowledge, and does not exclude certain kinds of problem solving. There is reason to believe that individualized (not personalized) instruction in didactical form could be achieved better electronically than by live instructors. Such a development could have the following consequences:

1. There could be a distinct separation of didactics or didactic teaching from what might be called encounter teaching. The latter would cover discussion, dialogue, creative activities, certain kinds of discovery learning, and interpersonal relationships that, so far as I know, nobody is seriously planning to program for the computers.

2. This separation could mean a redistribution of function in the instructional force along the following lines: (a) a large corps of classroom instructional operators trained to the level of technicians in two-year post-secondary programs; (b) instructional managers to choose and adapt programs, supervise instruction, and to make curricular decisions (these would probably be trained to the baccalaureate level plus one or two years of graduate work); (c) research and development personnel, trained to the doctoral level and working at the universities or in the laboratories of the industrial complexes producing the hard- and soft-ware for computer-aided instruction. Remuneration would be relatively low for the 80-85

---

[4] H. S. Broudy. "Some Potentials and Hazards of Educational Technology." In: *Planning for Effective Utilization of Technology in Education.* E. L. Morphet and D. L. Jesser, editors. Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, 1968. pp. 62-74.

percent in (a) and relatively high for the small numbers in (b) and (c).

"Teacher" would be the name reserved for the people involved in the encounter phases of schoolkeeping. I do not know what form their training would take—it would probably be closer to that of guidance counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and group therapists than to that of today's school teacher. Their salaries would be relatively high. The role of supervision would have to change accordingly, but that of the instructional manager would seem to be the most plausible. In small school complexes the instructional manager might combine the current roles of the supervisor and principal; in larger complexes, the principal would become the executive manager of the whole enterprise, but he would not necessarily be an expert in instruction.

Strange as such a development now seems, certain pressures make it more than a sheer speculation. One is the pressure to reduce teacher preparation to an apprentice type of on-the-job training. This anti-theoretical stance,[5] plus the potentialities opened up by micro-teaching and electronic-simulated teaching situations, make it unlikely that more than two years of post-secondary school training will be needed for the didactic phase of teaching. Another pressure comes from the argument that community involvement is more important for teacher training than formal work in professional education. Finally, there is the flight from teacher training in some of the universities. Some schools would prefer to concentrate on graduate study of education and the training of specialists, especially if the already meager theoretical component is to be reduced further or eliminated altogether.

The American Educational Research Association, perhaps the fastest growing educational organization in this country, is not quite sure whether or not it wants to stay with the Old Establishment, although there is no doubt that it wishes to enjoy the research opportunities the New Establishment affords. In the meantime, the study of education rather than personnel training will continue to be the focus of its interest. All in all, what with one thing and another, a plan for training the bulk of classroom teachers as apprentice technicians is probably in the cards, and coupling it with the use of technology might not be a bad solution.

---

[5] Repeatedly statisticians, school administrators, and the teachers themselves report that there is no correlation between anything save practice teaching in their school careers and success in teaching. It follows from this contention that the best way, if indeed not the only way, to evaluate the product of teacher-training programs is by teaching itself. All of which, logically pursued, would seem to end up in a form of apprentice teaching as the most viable form of teacher preparation.

The New Establishment fostered this view vigorously, but assumed tacitly that general education and study of one's field of subject matter were exceptions and should be retained; the theory to be eliminated from teacher training would be the courses in education. Unfortunately for this assumption, measures in general education and subject matter do not correlate impressively with teaching success either, and with good programmed instruction, these two would also become eminently dispensable. The Old Establishment's view on this issue is too mixed up for me to understand, much less to summarize.

One advantage of this development would be to dispel once and for all the myth that classroom teaching constitutes a profession. The fact is that classroom teachers receive far less specialized technical training than do plumbers or electricians. At best, they are people with two or three years of collegiate education, plus a few courses in "education," topped off by student teaching. If we accept the notion that the bulk of classroom teachers are to be technicians, we may be able to inject into the instructional force 10 or 15 percent of truly professionally trained personnel who will do the kind of thinking, diagnosing, and prescribing that cannot be expected from technicians. The more clearly instructional operators are recognized by themselves and everyone else as technicians, the more necessary the instructional managers and the encounter teachers will become. As matters now stand, people not even trained to a good technician level are under the illusion that they are much more than technicians.

Black Power vs. the Middle Class

The second focus of distress in the school system is the bid for decentralization of the control of urban schools' neighborhoods. The New York City experiment is not one of those better ideas with which Ford is so generous. It rejects the principle that made centralization a logical corollary of an ever increasingly interdependent and homogenized society; this is a dangerous ignoring of the social reality.

The decentralization move embarrasses the middle-class Establishment because the principle of self-determination is highly respected in the middle-class ideology, and the American tradition applauds a group's revolt when it is denied participation in a system devoted to representative democracy.

Moreover, the ideologues of the social studies (many of whom favor militant use of teacher power) have been urging the relativity of all values so long that it is now very awkward for them to oppose a group that takes this relativism seriously and opts for "black" values rather than "white" ones. Of course, just how non-middle-class blacks want their culture to be I do not know; at times it sounds as if they are merely protesting against their lack of goodies of which the middle class has such an abundance. At other times, something more fundamental seems to be at issue. And while no amount of talk and perspiration in behalf of blacks by whites can ever really atone for the injustice the whites have perpetrated or condoned, these injustices will not be remedied by reducing everything to black and white. Black sunlight does not grow vegetables; a sky good for a picnic is blue not black, a good piece of coal is black not white, and there are many good and bad things in the world that are red, orange, green, blue, and violet. As a clue to the nature or import of human concerns, color is not very significant; and moves to make it so, humane as they may be in the heat of urgency, are anti-humane in the best sense and in the long run.

I do not know how this challenge will fare. The best alternative is for the American school to assume seriously the role of the custodian of a humanistic culture rather than a middle-class or any other class culture. This is not a likely alternative so long as the social scientists make such a universalistic view—at any level of value judgment—scientifically unrespectable. Another is to allow dissenting groups to experiment with separateness and to protect the rest of the community from the effects of the experiment, if it turns out unfortunately. Of course, this would mean letting some neighborhoods and some states keep their schools segregated if they chose to do so. Groups probably will never learn their powers and limitations in any other way.[6]

A third alternative is that blacks will organize politically and economically and exert their influence on all kinds of establishments to achieve a more efficacious role in the social system. Certainly, this alternative is the one that other minorities have used successfully, and it does not run counter to the principle of representative democracy. What stands out clearly, however, is that decentralization is only incidentally an educational issue; it is rather a recognition of the bitter fact that until blacks have decent incomes, *and* decent housing, *and* decent schools almost simultaneously they cannot institute a self-sustaining chain reaction that marks the beginning of real progress for a depressed minority.

---

[6] An educative society, I suppose, is one that permits a group to grow through its experiments without perishing from its mistakes. Thus in educative societies, there are areas of tolerated delinquency for the young, for to grow each generation must experience risk, danger, and even evil when young. But unless society protects the young from irreversible bad effects, the wrong individuals may survive. One way of diagnosing the troubles of our generation gap is to say that the traditional areas of tolerated delinquency have lost their boundaries, so that real delinquency has taken their place as a means of growth.

Students vs. Administrators

The third distress in the system is the revolt of college students against the administration. I need not recount the sad and by now overfamiliar stories. Nor do I propose to weigh the merits of the issues. Rather I wish to note that this is not primarily an economic struggle of the poor against the rich, and although the black-white issue has been a factor in many campus riots, it is generally agreed that this is not usually the main factor.

It happens that the grievances of blacks fit into the more general pattern of protest against the government's war policy in Vietnam and against the college administration for not being more involved in social battles, and on the wrong side whenever it is involved. The administration seems to be allied with the military establishment, the industrial establishment, and the middle-class or upper-middle-class ethic, all more or less odious to the radical left or the militant blacks and often to both.

American students have learned what their counterparts abroad learned much earlier, viz., that a small number willing to be roughed up by the police can disrupt even a large university. If the student bid for power succeeds, there will be indeed a radical shift of forces within the social system we call education, for such success will filter down to the high schools, and even into the homes as far as teenagers are concerned. Already supervision of adolescents is beyond the actual power of parents—if adolescents put the matter to the test.

In this troubled area as in the other two, the Establishment is trussed up by its own machinery and the very principles which sanctify its authority. Once the principle of representative democracy is granted as valid in the governance of a university, there is no reason for excluding the most numerous group—the students—from governance. However, the procedural ponderance of the representative process often prevents the system from moving at all, let alone fast enough to meet a rapidly developing crisis. The greatest obstacle to a vigorous and constructive response to the threat of disruption is that within the faculty itself there is a guilty realization that the interests of the university are closely allied to the military-industrial complex, even though scholarship, the traditional function of the intellectual, is supposed to remain independent of these vested interests.

Between an intellectually pure but indigent university and an affluent albeit slightly compromised one, the administration and the most influential faculty members probably will continue to choose affluence. They console themselves with the fact that this affluence showers blessings on scholars and students that otherwise would not be available. As between the proverbs: "Beware the Greeks bearing gifts" and "Don't look a gift horse in the mouth," the choice, on balance, is predictable; unfortunately the guilt feeling lingers on.

Here, as in the other distress areas, the educational system is facing situations that are not primarily educational at all. Educationally, if students were given free choice in their studies at any modern university, and if they were relieved of course exams and grades—as they easily could be if we put our minds to it—they could, and in the main would, choose on the basis of the intellectual content of the courses and the intellectual competence of the instructors. Most universities right now could meet the *educational* demands of the protestors for relevance without much serious internal change. But student protest is not a primarily educational issue; it is political and ideological, and it spilled over into the streets of Chicago, where the real issues were brought out.

Educationally the university could properly insist on a learner status for the student and the authority of the faculty and administration, but politically the student is not inferior to the faculty or to the administration, and as a citizen his rights to speak and agitate cannot be infringed by invoking the student-teacher authority relationship. As with the other two areas of distress, this one is caused by uneasy shifts within the larger social system. The strata are shifting because in a technological mass society the desire for individuality, for personhood, for identity is not automatically realized in a mass production economy, a mass system of communication, a mass system of ideas.

I have no unusual remedies for the situation. The end of the war in Vietnam may relieve tension, but I doubt that students will be content to play the child after a taste of adult power. The system might try letting students be as adult as they think they are and let them also pay the price for learning the hard way, but this is a big risk. The art of governance in the future may be to provide within a social system space for experimental attacks on the system, a space that is bounded by safeguards for the system as a whole—if the experiment goes sour—and gateways into the system if the experiment succeeds. Can we protect the experimenter from his mistakes? We can and ought to protect him from irreversible evil consequences, but we cannot remove all risk if the experience is to be real and not a childish make believe.

Observations

That three major areas of distress within the educational system are the result of power shifts within the social system as a whole should stimulate us to reexamine the strengths and weaknesses of education in that system and as a system in its own right. As to the school as a social system, I would observe that:

1. Operationally, the principle of the division of labor has been distorted into virtual uselessness. The lines of responsibility between the school, family, church, government, and industry are now virtually indiscernible. Conditions for schooling have been confused with schooling itself. The school's attempt to control all such conditions has not succeeded, but it has tended to relieve other social institutions from the responsibility for doing their own jobs. Within the system itself the duties of the various echelons of personnel grow without rhyme or reason. Lunchroom and playground supervision get affixed to the teaching of arithmetic and reading; clerical tasks have the same priority as instruction; pseudo-specialties spring up everywhere.[7]

2. There is a profound discrepancy between the public's expectations of the school and the competence of the personnel recruited to meet these expectations. Schooling is made the pivot of all social well-being and progress, but it is entrusted to a teaching force that is marginal in talent, training, and career commitment. Our most important social commitment is entrusted, in large part, to people for whom teaching is a part-time, temporary, or supplementary employment. The teaching force is made up neither of

---

[7] By a pseudo-specialty, I mean one that comprises tasks that require less intellectual competence than the one from which they have been split off, for example, to make the coordination and facilitation of PTA activities in a community an educational specialty. A teacher or supervisor to whom such a task is assigned as a specialty, or one to whom is assigned system-wide responsibility for keeping track of visual aids equipment, has lowered the level of his intellectual functioning and has brought into being a pseudo-specialty.

interchangeable, skilled technicians who can be freely plugged into any school, nor of highly individualized professional persons who can adapt to any schoolroom in terms of knowledge.

3. Despite the rising expenditures for public schools, a $500-$600 per pupil cost is still the bargain of the century. Simple custodial care of one child at baby-sitting rates ($1 an hour) would come to $1,260 for 180 seven-hour days. The strange ambivalence of the American public toward its schools is illustrated by the simultaneous assertion that (a) the schools are bad, inefficient, and actually miseducative and (b) that the cause of the plight of the disadvantaged is that they drop out of school. Whatever our reservations about teacher strikes may be, it must be conceded that nothing short of closing the schools can make some people aware of the economic facts of educational life.

4. Sooner or later, the school as a social system will disintegrate into a thousand fragmented programs, courses, and curricula if it continues to cater to an unlimited plurality of cultural predilections. The authority of the several intellectual disciplines, including the humanities and the fine arts, provides the schools with a shield against the whims and prejudices that various groups are tempted to elevate into curricular demands. As a social institution the school could properly represent that intellectual tradition, rather than the bias of this or that social class. In addition, the right of school personnel to make the fundamental decisions about curriculum and method could be established by their mastery of a set of professional studies that are intellectually defensible. I believe that such a set could be developed. I happen to believe also that the American public would gladly support claims to autonomy so based.

If citizen groups have tried to interfere with the curriculum and instructional policies of the schools, it is because of two factors: one is that the Old Establishment was not overly fussy about intellectual defensibility, and the other has been the admission by that Establishment, especially its administrative wing, that it had no standards for making curriculum choices themselves, for example, witness the use of "innovative" as a standard. In such circumstances there is little left but to invite the citizenry to settle curriculum problems by a counting of noses and the flexing of political muscle.

Yet if educational decisions properly fall within the domain of the educational professional, the scrutiny of the school as a social system and its place in the total social order *is* everybody's business. The battle for the control of the schools is a question of stresses and distresses within a social system and among social systems and should fall under the general scrutiny of the citizen. One would like to hope that out of the struggle between the two Establishments is now emerging a strong cadre of men and women with sufficient talent, training, and commitment to spearhead a genuine reconstruction of the school (not necessarily a reconstruction of the society by the school alone) into a social system that can endure a high degree of stress without too much distress.

Educational Supervision: Dead or Alive?

RICHARD L. FOSTER

IN PREPARING for this address, I have tried to think back to my 15 or 20 years as a supervisor and as a curriculum person and have attempted to take a historical perspective of how we have gotten where we are today. As I look at ASCD and at us, there are half a dozen or so contributions that I believe we have uniquely made to American education.

Contributions of Supervision

First of all, we have changed supervision (at least in principle) from inspection to a consultative relationship. We have actually established in principle the idea that supervision is a peer relationship, a relationship which either person can break off at any time if he feels that it is not going any place. I believe we have put ourselves on a higher pedestal because we have moved lower down toward the action. Also, I hear fewer people today talking about supervision with that "angelic" kind of look—as though they had something somebody else did not have.

Second, we have brought a unique and constant position of humaneness into the profession. Even when people after Sputnik were taking their own bandwagon ride, some of us remained constant to the idea that both the affective and the cognitive domains have a right to be in the educational program.

We realize that the affective and cognitive domains cannot be separated except for minute research purposes. How I feel determines how I learn and how I learn determines how I feel, and both these factors are going the same circle. Beware of those people who want to take either one without the other because, if they do, they are only half-dressed.

Third, when everybody has been talking about how to segregate the areas of the curriculum, and when schools in many places have been advocating arrangements such as departmentalization, or prekindergarten, we have been pushing for the interrelationship of the curriculum. There are a few places today where I hear people talk about a core curriculum, a fused curriculum, or the interrelationship of learning among all the areas, and a few places where I hear people talk about the child and the materials serving the child. I think that it has probably been one of the ASCD's constant positions that if you go off on one of these separate little plans, enjoy your trip but don't expect anything to happen!

Fourth, I think we have done another important thing. One of the ideas that bugged American education for a long time—and I never really understood what it meant—was that of "scope and sequence." It took me a long time to understand the words and then I knew the phrase had no meaning. Scope and sequence actually meant "how people could put things down on paper that were logical but not the way people learned." For example, we have had tremendous numbers of guides that followed scope and sequence, and then you visited the classrooms and you could find no relationship between the two. So, many of us were saying early, "That's lovely for paper, but has relatively no importance in the learning of a child." Even when some people tried to revise the terminology, by calling it "spiral theory," we didn't bite. People said that when you go into the first, eighth, eleventh, and thirteenth grades of American history there is a spiral involved in which things are learned at a higher conceptual level. Then when I visited eleventh-grade classes I couldn't tell whether I was in the fifth or eighth grade, so I knew that that idea, too, was not going to make it along the way. We have, in my judgment, consistently challenged this type of approach.

Fifth, I think we have been a group that has searched for an instructional model. This would not be a model that everybody would buy and make into a paradigm. Rather, it would be a way of working through the morass of how to move from knowledge and skills and understandings into conceptual development of some kind.

It was easier for Bruner to write his book than it was to take us to the concepts from knowledge and skills, and it was much harder to take us the next step. Once you have concepts, how do you know you have modified behavior or attitudes in any way? Many ASCD members have worked hard to find a satisfactory instructional model.

Sixth, there have been many among us who, very slowly, have been trying to find a way to evaluate responsibly what we are doing. I worry, as some of my colleagues do, that if we had built the Edsel car, we would still be building it. This would be because there was no viable model to show that it had gone out of existence, or should not have been produced in the beginning, because nobody was buying it.

So I see a number of consistent things that we have done. What's the result? My life has been in the classroom. I see many individual demonstrations that you and I have worked out with teachers that have had an effect on the children, and that have had an effect on other teachers. I have seen us change the summer workshop from a place where people did *our* thing to a place where people did *their* thing, and where we actually set up opportunities for people to experiment with the kind of ideas that they wanted. I have even seen some bright people who realize that the major purpose of summer school is for people to experiment with what they want to do, because if it does not work, you can turn it off after five or six weeks, whereas you're frightened to start it for thirty-six weeks, because nobody knows where to stop it.

Seventh, we have known for some time that if you produce curriculum guides the only persons who learn anything from the guide are the people who work on it. If you are still going through that game of producing a guide and thinking other people will read it, let me tell one story.

I was on the stage recently in California with the president of the music association, which had just produced a new guide. He said to the audience, "This music guide will revolutionize music in California." I followed him on the program and very carefully said, "Do me a favor, would you, a year from now? Call a meeting of all the teachers who have a copy of this guide, and ask them to bring the guide with them. Fifty percent won't be able to find it. When you get them there, ask the other fifty percent to open it, and then don't be too surprised if you hear the creak of that book as it is being opened for the first time." Some of us know this. We know, for instance, that we ought to have every teacher working on a curriculum guide. When he gets through we ought to publish one copy, give it to him, and let him take it home, cherish it, do whatever he needs in regard to it, but don't believe the guide is changing anything else!

Eighth, we have used educational television in a variety of ways. We have done some good things with it for demonstration purposes. We have used it for self-analysis, with teachers observing themselves in the classroom situation. I think that we have finally come to know that television is not going to replace anything or anybody in the learning process. It will be simply another tool that we use at the knowledge level.

I have also seen, as a result of some of the early work, some changes in experimental new proposals that curriculum people have made. I think they have started to break down the whole question of what is required in a teaching act; I see, for instance, curriculum consultants and other consultants working on the clinical phase of teaching, helping teachers to see themselves and to see other people. Take the Prescott model, going way back into the 1940's, and redevelop it for the present time. I see curriculum people taking leadership on the whole question of the organizational skills that are needed in the classroom. I find that we are getting better at being able to say something about how you individualize instruction rather than just telling people it is a good idea. Let me tell you, it is a long distance from talking about individualizing to really individualizing in the classroom. And I see us helping teachers on how to work in small groups and large groups.

Ninth, then, I see curriculum people working on the learning cycle, actually trying to help teachers work through a hypothesis in the classroom. Then, too, I see us going back to the very early days when Hilda Taba was talking about this methodology in Chicago (actually, the curriculum people picking it up again), saying, "Let's do that ongoing kind of action research to find out what's happening," because the other kind of research has not given us any answers, or if it has, the answers have been five years late.

As one young lady said recently to one of our esteemed leaders, who is a great guy, "This afternoon you told us we could do this, this, and this; but man, it's four hours later now and the game has changed!" Oh, boy, that is learned fast in a situation.

What then is the effect of schooling on youngsters? Well, I think we have seen some kids "turned on" in our schools, and I think we have seen places where we have actually hooked a few youngsters into believing that learning is important. I think we have increased their awareness of life by taking youngsters into the broad expanse of the American scene. I think we have even increased the length of time that some teachers can stay in the classroom and still be important to the youngsters. Early research held that you could measure teacher growth for only about five years. It was lousy research, but it was there. And I saw some school districts that were very capable of "turning off" teachers early. Some districts do it in the first week of orientation, so it is almost a planned method of turning people off. On the other hand, I have seen some systems able to help people six, seven, or ten years on the job. Occasionally we even see a district or a curriculum person who can rehabilitate some of us.

I also think I have seen improvement in the condition of many schools. Generally there appears to be more humaneness in most places, even though this may be an illusion. I do not now see as many schools as in former years in which you have to sit and look at the back of somebody's neck, trying to figure out what to do in the situation. I believe I even see some places where children get a chance to talk a little bit more than in previous years and this is great, even though I am absolutely convinced we all talk too much.

I have seen these kinds of change take place. I have even seen some places in which the student council is becoming a student council instead of the object of the principal to carry out his will. Yet there is a bigger picture in the land today than that which I have been describing.

Where the Action Is

As I look again historically, I see that America has been built on a dream toward action. We have always been going where the action is. As I think back about Christopher Columbus, and whatever his dream had to be, I believe it had to be a moment of courage when he said, "I'm going to go out and see what is there." And I look at the American Revolution, and look at Tom Paine, and Samuel Adams, and even at Jefferson, these were men of adventure and thrust—they wanted to go where the action was. And as I look at the frontier and study it carefully, I realize it was not really built by the rugged individual going out alone, but by a whole group of supportive people who wanted to go and find out if there was action out there.

We have had some changes in this situation, and I think this is starting to give us a part of our problem. One of our changes is the suburb, which is a very interesting example of a movement away from action. The city is a troubled world and most of the white people who can afford it and who have no deep conviction otherwise have moved to the suburbs to find peace.

I had an experience with this recently when one of my psychologist friends ran into a person who lived in the same community where I was then working. He had just moved in and the psychologist said, "A friend of mine, Dick Foster, works out in your area." He could see by the person's response that he was not very enthusiastic about this news. Finally my friend pushed a little further. The other guy said, "You know, I moved out to that suburb because I understood there were some drugs in the city, there were some kids who were doing crazy things, there was long hair, there were even boys and girls making out, all kinds of things, and I went out to the suburbs where that guy is and they still do it out there." And he said, "If that guy leaves, I think all those problems will leave." I knew that I had power, but I did not know I had that much influence!

So there are people moving out with the idea that they want to find sunshine, and a golf course, and (somebody forgot to tell them) a big yard. They also met a real estate man who told them it was easy to commute, that it would be only 20 minutes away if there were no traffic. (Then they took off in the traffic and found that it was an hour and a half away.) There may even be a disguised form of racism in the move, though they are not quite willing to admit this, because it is still unpopular. Then they got to the suburbs and thought that they would suddenly be free men; instead, they found themselves fearful persons.

I am watching the number of subdivisions that are going up now in the suburbs in which they are putting quasi-walls around the subdivision; in fact I saw one the other day that had the towers coming up and I wondered when they were going to attack, because you could have set it up beautifully in the form of defense mechanisms.

These suburbanites also thought they would be very independent and then they found they had to ask their neighbors to baby-sit for them, to share a carpool because you can't walk downtown; and suddenly instead of being independent they were dependent. They thought that, once they got there, all their problems would disappear and children would be obedient. And the children are not buying one bit of it. Suddenly, in a world that they had thought would bring peace and solace and comfort, they found only frustration. Suddenly there is violence against themselves, as a result.

Emerson said that the language of the street is always more expressive than the language of the academy. I never try to use the language of the academy. I am afraid nobody I care about will understand it.

With the staff and with some people we had done well, living in a white suburb at the time, and working in it. Our kids were beautiful kids. We decided to invite in 400 black youngsters from the inner city to spend a day with us, to find out what it was really like. The county director of NAACP talked on racism, I followed and talked on alternatives, borrowing from John F. Kennedy. Then they went into small groups to discuss various topics. It was a beautiful day for the kids; they got along magnificently. I didn't see a youngster who had any difficulty in the encounter and I think that everybody went away saying, "This is the way it ought to be."

We held a Board meeting the next Monday night and we had 1,500 citizens out. It was interesting to learn the kinds of things they were worried about and that we ought to think very much about. For example, "Who brought those dirty kids in?" or "Did you see that black youngster and that white girl walking down the corridor?" And I said, "Yes, I did. What did you have in mind?" I knew what he had in mind—that was my problem. There is a movement, you see, away from the action.

Now I think the same kind of movement, historically, has been going on in education. It used to be nice to be able to say, "Well, I've given my guts in that classroom. I think I'll go to the University to teach." And I even have some strange colleagues, who once said, "Well, even that's got possibility of danger, so I think I'll become a college president." There were also some who said within the system, "The classroom is getting too hot. I think I'll become a principal or a supervisor."

What does this all look like when we set it up? We were in the process—in a very slow way—of making great moves in education. Supervisors and consultants helped us get into the 'forties and the 'fifties and it was grand while it lasted, but right now as I look at it, it was a pleasureful "so what" experience. What does it look like now? Well, let me tell it to you the way I think it really is.

First, from the point of view of the young people today, I think that they fully believe that our schools lack any relevant goals for them. I think they believe what was said at our last ASCD conference, that a school is a place where you go to have your education interrupted, that a school is not a place where you increase your options, but a school is a place where they take away your options. They teach you what you don't know and pound it into you. If you don't learn it, they suspend you. Man, that's an interesting kind of circle; if you skip school for three days you get suspended for three more. It is really a very provocative kind of system; if you are a bright kid, you know how to get six days, and only be responsible for three.

Second, I think they are also saying, both black and white, "We're turned off in terms of what the usual school is doing." We have three or four characteristics we detect about the school—number one, we feel the uselessness of our part in the school. You hear black youngsters saying it more vehemently maybe than some of our white youngsters; they say "you've made me useless in terms of the school. As a result, I don't have any feeling about your school and whether it survives or not."

Likewise, we have made our schools interesting bureaucracies. You make a person feel useless and then you put in a hardline bureaucracy that takes eternity to get through and you have two of the conditions for frustration that most schools have.

Third, we have done beautifully with systems of instructional segregation although the research over and over again has told us it has not worked. Some of my colleagues have given up the whole program of special education because they think this is one of the biggest cop-outs we have ever engaged in. For example, there are special classes for educable mentally retarded (EMR), special classes for trainable mentally retarded (MR), special classes for educationally handicapped; then you follow the kids and they live there an eternity, but they forget to do one thing—grow. Special education is a nice hideout to make schools more comfortable for teachers and, by the way, every time we get rid of one group out of the classroom, we get another group that we need to get out of the classroom. Pretty soon, if we keep this process going, that one kid who is left is going to be lonesome, because everybody's out doing his special thing.

Fourth, we have taken power away from young people. Actually, it is a rare situation, in my judgment, in which young people have equal power with the people who are teachers or administrators. I guess what I am saying is that I am looking for people in our jobs who appreciate so much the power they have that they're willing to give the power away. And I don't find many people willing to give power away, especially if the demand comes in language different from the nice polite way in which we have been used to hearing demands.

Fifth, to make sure that nobody gets in to mess up our system, we have credentials. And that means you have got to stay with the game long enough so that you have been sucked in personally, and so that you, too, will feel useless, powerless, but have a credential. And this is the model that our young people are fighting against.

They are fighting also because they know that much of what we are doing is irrelevant. Let me give you at least two examples. I could go down a whole list, but I don't want to.

Number one, look what has happened with Project Head Start. Every measure I see in regard to Head Start shows that children prosper in that six or eight week summer program; but by the time we have had them in either kindergarten or the first grade for a year, we have been able to wash out their gains.

And the second one is interesting. We have spent a lot of money in Title I on compensatory education. We have found that if we continue to do more of the same things that we have been doing in compensatory education, nothing happens. This means that basically what we were doing in the beginning probably wasn't any good either. I believe that all the safe places are now gone.

Now comes the question: What about supervisors? I believe that the role that you and I have been using is dead. This got us into the 'forties and the 'fifties and we are thankful. I have a hunch that if you are in a very select place you may be able to use that model until retirement if you are over 55, but I think you had better select your places very carefully or you won't succeed.

If we as curriculum people are going to succeed, we are going to have to make ours a high risk job. Supervisors are going to have to become *leaders in educational revolts*. Now what does this mean? I can tell you, for example, what I am saying with the staff in our system:

Whatever your job is, describe for me in two or three pages what you would do next year if you were rehired in that job; what kind of beachhead you would establish as a new model of doing something, and tell me the people with whom you are going to work on that beachhead. Tell me your strategy to move that beachhead to other schools if it works, tell me how you are going to do internal and external evaluation.

Whether your project is funded internally or externally is irrelevant, but if you can't describe what you'd like to do and you don't have anybody who wants to do it with you, and you don't know how to move it after you do it, what would you like to do next year? You hold the options. You can either opt in or opt out, depending on whether you can decide what you are going to do with it. And by the way, you might get a terrible shock as you walk around with people saying, "I'd like to work with you on this particular idea," and they say, "Wouldn't you like to do something else?" You'll know how provocative you are in the scene.

Possibilities for Growth

Now, I know, that is a terrible idea to suggest. It suggests a hard and tough sort of relevancy. I can help you a little bit with maybe eight, nine, or ten possibilities of what I think you might do.

First, for instance, you might go to the superintendent and say, "Look, I've been talking about change. We are building a new school as a change model. Let me describe it. It's going to have open spaces with no interior walls, we're going to do multi-graded instruction, we're going to have every youngster on a contract in terms of the skills for individualized instruction, we're going to have a multi-learning center in the middle, we're going to have collaborative planning, and I would like to be principal for two or three years to show you how it can be done." And then nobody can say that you're talking about what *they* ought to do—you're saying, "I would like to be the principal for the first two or three years to get it going, to use as a demonstration model."

Second, if you are not building any new schools (and I know there will always be somebody who said after that first one, "I'm out of that one. We aren't growing."), then my suggestion is that you go in and say, "I would like to take one of the wings or one of the cores and develop a school within a school showing you how we could make it a personalized learning experience, and I would like to be the master teacher for a year or two to develop the school within a school."

If you don't like those two, there is a third alternative that I suggest. You say that we've been talking for a long time about the fact that the school shouldn't be a single learning place. It ought also to be out in the community. So you propose that you would like to develop an in-community school in which the youngster will spend about two periods in class. Then you are going to work with everybody in the community who would like to help in his own special way. The school will contract with the people out in the community where the youngster will go for each of his other periods and you will coordinate this whole group of people we have been talking about in the in-community schools. Or, you may want to try something else.

Fourth, let's try a collaborative problem-solving situation in which we bring together half a dozen teachers and work with them on what we would like to do in the classroom that would be unique, different, imaginative, and creative with youngsters. We won't decide until after we get through planning for the week which one is going to teach the project. I might teach it for a week, or it might be one of the other teachers. Then we'll come back and evaluate the experience and then go back again and start our next collaborative.

Fifth, if you don't want to do any of those four, there is a new model in American education and it's a tough model. It's called TTT: the Training of Teachers of Teachers. Under the program a parity has to be set up among the university, the school district, and the community. And I can tell you, having served on that advisory committee, that if you think it's tough to get public schools to share equally—you ought to try those universities. University people use such interesting language—we know, because we have used it, too. They can tell you at the highest level of academia why they shouldn't change. In fact, I didn't even understand some of the words—they were so beautifully put together they were meaningless. To try to get them, actually, to take public schools off the plantation and to deal with them as equals was a tremendous task. Then we had to move the next step, to say to the people in the community—the black community, the poor community, the Chicano community, the Indian community—"Come in with us and share equally. We'll decide together how we're going to train teachers, and how we're going to train the trainers of teachers, because historically nobody has trained them." What you might do is volunteer, by saying to your superintendent, "I'd like to direct a program of TTT to show how you can get people to operate in parity in the situation."

Sixth, if you don't like that you might try another one, by saying, "One of the needs of teachers is a clinical model and that model has to do with the sensitivities that I have and that they have. What I'd like to do is to set up a group for the year in which we have sensitivity training, T-groups, confrontations, whatever is needed. As a result, teachers will go into the classroom freed to be themselves."

Seventh, if you don't like any of those, you might say, "I'd like to work on the idea of an open arrangement for people to free the district from bureaucracy, and I'd like to work with all the other administrators to teach them how to give away power."

These are hard tasks. You might want to select some other, but I am hoping it will be a relevant one. All the things I have been talking about here, in my judgment, would take you where the action is. You would be doing, releasing, and you would be ready for the next risk.

There is one more that you might like to take up. Most of us who are white, who have had a long history with school work, have had relatively little recent experience with meaningful dialogue with militant blacks or militant Chicanos. The task, you might say, is: "I'd like to take the leadership role in showing other people how to negotiate with people who are angry." We would tape the negotiation, we would watch you in operation, and we would all learn symbolically how to act in that particular situation.

We need a new batch of supervisors who are fired for risk taking instead of lunch-hour taking. Don't miss the risk taking, by the way; the fun's there. Don't make a mistake about that. You'll be tired every night when you go to bed after taking risks all day long, but you'll sleep. The reverse in so many cases is happening at the present time—there's no excitement all day long, but you can't sleep, and usually when you can't sleep you have to ask for a raise, because, you know, you have to have more guilt to put you back to sleep again.

Let me conclude, because I think I have said whatever I want to say. We made a major contribution as supervisors and consultants in the 'forties and the 'fifties. It would have been good enough for the 'sixties and the 'seventies, but the world changed too fast! Maybe it's not healthy, but it has happened. We could spend our time five years ago in the luxury of discussing, as we did, whom we should allow into ASCD. Wasn't that a luxurious conversation that we engaged in? I think now we ought to ask, how do we get the *real* people in? How do we get them to join us?

We must now be the action leaders and go where the action is. If we don't, we will become like the human appendix—it has no known purpose, but it becomes diseased and has to be operated on to be removed. We could become that appendix.

For those among us who glimpse a brave new world, all I can say is, "Get in it, get bloody, but get relevant!" It is amazing how many youngsters you will have following you around because somehow you make life different.

Remember, you can reject an idea of a person without rejecting the maker of the idea. I feel good as a human being living in the middle of the bloody scene. I feel good as a relevant person. I would hate to be rejected, even though every idea is up for testing.

The New Supervisor: Caring, Coping, Becoming

MURIEL CROSBY

FORCES at work in our society are causing educators to take a new look at roles and functions. It has been predicted that the school superintendent of the future will not be a professional educator, but a major in business administration. The rise of teacher militancy is shaping new and unfamiliar roles for the teacher. The supervisor, bred on the service concept of supervision, looks in wonder, and sometimes dismay, at his own role. In this new order, does he have a role? More than most staff members, in the emergence of new roles, the supervisor is alone, overlooked, more or less isolated in a world in upheaval.

The Plight of the Supervisor

The supervisor, to survive, must shape a new role for himself, one requiring new concepts, new skills, new relationships. The old service concept will and must survive, but only in a new context. It is time for supervisors to create their own militancy, not in self-interest, but in the interest of teachers and children and in the interest of effective educational change.

Social Forces at Work in the Community

There is hardly a supervisor who cannot identify the long list of major social forces at work in the community which impinge upon the school. Supervisors have witnessed the life and death struggles of the city. They have observed the demolition and replacement of older sections of the city. They know what the displacement of people means as they have lived with the dispossessed who move on to other sections of the city, creating new slums to take the place of the old. They have experienced the bitterness of people whose substandard homes are replaced by new homes they cannot afford to live in. They know what it means to see the tax base for the support of public education whittled away through the removal of private property for public housing, throughways, and other public purposes.

They experience continually the results of the declining power of inner-city schools to attract and hold well qualified teachers. They struggle with the poorly qualified teacher to fill a role too big and too desperate for even the master teacher. In many cities, supervisors have lived through the heartbreaking experience of the cycle of social and racial segregation, desegregation, integration, and resegregation. This is the cycle that is evident as population mobility and the flight to the suburbs change legal segregation to residential segregation before a generation of children, who were to be affected by the Supreme Court Decision of 1954, has left childhood.

The supervisor knows these social forces are at work which are changing the nature of education and creating a demand for a new education. Yet the emotional impact through day by day living with teachers on the front line of this greatest of all social revolutions is far greater than the intellectual impact.

And constantly, the supervisor hears on all sides that education is ineffective, that the schools are tradition-bound, and that teacher education for this new world leaves something to be desired. Such supervisors often wonder if the students of the social scene know the realities of teaching and of working with teachers.

The Reality of Change

Students of the American scene today speak of the impact of swift, accelerating change in the social and economic life of the country, and warn professional educators of the need to keep pace with change. They warn us of the outmoded value system associated with the institution of education in a democracy and accuse us of living in the past. I often wonder, however, what would happen to these scholars if they were suddenly placed in a public school in the inner-city.

Following are a few illustrations of the reality of change every teacher, in every inner-city school in the country, may face every day in his classroom.

- A seven-year-old, especially affectionate toward her teacher, comments aloud as she paints at the easel, "I hate white people." The teacher, taken aback, responds, "I thought *we* loved each other." And the child, pausing in her painting to study the teacher's face, asks in wonder, "Are *you* white?"
- A bright, wiry lad, who thoroughly enjoys school, enters his classroom after a weekend of rioting, suspicious, ugly, and antagonistic. His teacher, understanding his dilemma, places a comforting hand on his shoulder, to be rebuffed with a snarling, "Take your hand off me."
- A group of teen-age girls, huddling together on the sidewalk outside the school, observes a young couple passing by, hand in hand, engrossed in themselves. With a shout of, "This is get-Whitey-day," the huddled girls fly at the couple, beating with fists, pulling and tearing clothes, scratching until blood runs down the faces of the young couple.
- A young high school teacher, assigned a group of fifteen-year-olds, non-readers, presents a carefully prepared lesson in the social studies, using well selected visual materials instead of a text. His boys listen quietly because they like him. And when the teacher has finished, a lad puts his arm across the teacher's shoulder, asking, "Why are you getting so excited about the Great Lakes? You aren't going to live there, are you?"

For the students of the American scene, these are the experiences teachers recall when they hear the scholars express change in global terms and erudite language.

And how does the administrator experience the changes he is charged with knowing little about?

- In his recruitment of teachers, the administrator is aware of one qualification the community has expected of its teachers—"good moral character." Nothing so illuminates the changing value system of a community as the fact that it now accepts without question the appointment of young teachers who have children out of marriage. The administrator simply tries to place such young men and women in schools outside their immediate residential neighborhoods, for he knows full well that an angry parent frequently screams insults at the teacher whose child was born out of marriage.
- Consider the reactions of an administrator who is notified by police of the proven charge that a young teacher has given syphilis to four men. There is no question of the action needed for health precautions, but whether or not this situation relates to "good moral character" becomes a dilemma. The very people who used to sit in judgment of those who violated the established, middle-class moral code, now sit in judgment of an administrator who would "hold youthful mistakes" against an applicant.

- In the preparation of college-bound seniors, a history teacher omits a required historical period which the students must have in preparation for entrance exams. When questioned by her supervisor, she stoutly maintains that her academic freedom is challenged and she will defend it.

- A sixteen-year-old boy, having indicated his desire to be heard by the Board of Education, appears when his name is called. Insolently, he surveys the Board members and begins his statement with the rebuke, "I resent being kept waiting by you guys." And a second group of tough, boisterous youth demands fearlessly, "Give us the money to run our own program or we'll burn the building down."

Hear, oh scholars, who charge school people with being unaware of the great changes occurring in the life of the nation. You who look down from your scholarly pinnacles, wherein the disciplines are enshrined, where the developmental nature of the learner is theoretically described, where teachers are chided for ignoring research, we invite you down into the valleys shadowed by your mountains so that you may get the feel of the reality of change.

All children and youth bring into the classroom, every day, all that they have experienced. Children who in the community are experiencing violence and destruction, complete disregard for law and order, ridicule of a value system which respects those who work for what they earn, who are drilled in hatred of other groups, are teaching their teachers to understand change. Their teachers need help in coping with this change, not rebuke from the scholars who often would be completely overwhelmed by one day in a classroom in the inner-city.

Supervisors cry in all earnestness, "We don't need to be told that the world is changing. We need to be helped to create new understandings, new strategies in helping teachers cope with change. More than this, we need help in creating with others a new education for this new world."

My purpose in sketching the reality of change is to establish the fact that supervisors live with change, sharing in its effects upon principals, upon teachers, and upon children and youth and their families.

More than this, supervisors are highly sensitive to the fact that education must change. They have shared the trauma of teachers who discover that what worked for them in fostering learning in the immediate past does not work with youth in revolution, nor for children who are victims of it.

Supervisors, faced with demands for a new leadership for a new education, are floundering in a sea of confusion. To get at the problems affecting the supervisors' role and functions, to find out how supervisors have reached their present position of vulnerability, are essential steps before the new supervisor, currently demanded, may be created.

Supervision Revealed

As an educator whose professional life has included the teaching of children, the teaching of teachers, supervision in a large city school system, and supervision of student teachers in a great metropolitan area, as a college teacher preparing supervisors, and as an associate superintendent responsible for supervision, curriculum development, and educational program planning and development, and, finally, as a consultant in urban education, working generally with teachers and supervisors across the nation, my experience has provided a close and intimate knowledge of supervisors and supervision.

The current revolution, with its tremendous impact upon the schools and upon education, the rising militancy of teachers and of the American public have created what might be legitimately described as a crisis-situation for supervisors.

In the negotiations movement of teachers, supervisors are being classified as "management," yet few supervisors have the administrative authority that goes with management.

In the current racial revolution, the schools are the focal point of attack and the supervisor is frequently delegated to act as liaison between schools and community, attempting to justify practices and programs for which he has frequently had no voice in decision making.

I believe that supervision is an essential instrument of quality education.

I believe that supervisors are much more knowledgeable about the needs of children and youth and of teachers than anyone else in a public school system.

I know many teachers who would never have become effective professionals without the support and help of supervisors.

I have seen supervisors over the country rendered impotent in carrying out all kinds of assignments which have nothing to do with supervision.

And, I have pondered on the current crisis in supervision, seeking an explanation of how supervisors reached their current vulnerable position.

When the editor of *Educational Leadership* sent me copies of the 60 articles published in *Educational Leadership* during 1960-68 which dealt either with supervision or had direct relationship to the roles and functions of supervisors, I realized that here was an important resource which might throw light upon the present status of supervision and give some direction to the critical need of creating a genuine basis for professionalizing supervision.

This is the background for the report which follows. I have been deliberately blunt, direct, and provocative in my analysis. The present time permits no softness nor mistaken kindness, for, in my judgment, supervisors are important people and the future of quality education is directly related to their ability to create new roles and functions. If the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development cannot provide the leadership needed, it cannot expect to remain as a professional home for its supervisor members. I firmly believe, however, that it can provide such leadership.

A Quantitative Analysis *

In searching for the causes of the present status of supervision, I first made a quantitative analysis of the 60 articles, searching for identification of prime concerns and their relative importance, the identification of the spokesmen for supervision, revealed by the professional positions they held, and finally studying the "time-line" of peaks and valleys of concern.

Findings, Implications, and Questions Which Must Be Answered. The quantitative analysis reveals some interesting implications on the responsibility of ASCD, through its official magazine, to provide for one of the most important segments of its membership, i.e., supervisors, and to deal with one of its two major purposes in being: supervision.

It should be understood in analyzing these data that:

1. Some, but not many, unsolicited manuscripts are published, in relation to the total number, in *Educational Leadership.***

2. Most manuscripts are solicited by the editor, with the help of the Publications Committee and the Executive Committee, from

---

* Editor's Note: The 60 articles analyzed here were a preliminary and tentative selection of materials for the ASCD volume, *Supervision: Emerging Profession: Readings from Educational Leadership.* At least 10 articles were later eliminated, while more than this number were added, including several articles published during 1968-69. The total number of articles in each part also was changed and the materials themselves were later rearranged in the five sections.

** Editor's Note: In the 1968-69 publication year, more than half the articles published were unsolicited.

individuals recommended as being competent or experienced on a particular topic or subject.

3. The Publications Committee, with the editor, determines the theme of the magazine for each year, suggests the area of concern to be developed in each issue, and submits its recommendations for approval to the Executive Committee.***

Therefore, the focus of the magazine and of each issue depends on the perceptions and sensitivities related to needs of the total membership, by two leadership groups, the Publications Committee and the Executive Committee. These two committees are greatly influenced by suggestions and recommendations from the Board of Directors, the Steering Committee, and the Commissions, Councils, and Committees. Within this context the editor proceeds to build each issue of *Educational Leadership*.

1. ASCD assumes responsibility for leadership in supervision and curriculum. Despite the emergence of critical problems and issues in education, ASCD's responsibility is to determine the relationship of these to its two major concerns. In general, the data reveal that certainly supervision has not received the lion's share of attention. Only 2 of the 9 years represented, 1961 and 1963, reveal a reasonably modest attention.

The year 1966, with 18 articles, was the best year, quantitatively speaking. It should be recalled that between 1965 and 1967, supervisor members were militant in their demands for greater emphasis on the supervisor and supervision as proper functions of ASCD. This was the period of near-crisis when supervisors challenged ASCD on its capacity for providing a professional home for its supervisor members. Many steps were and are being taken by ASCD to meet this challenge. No more telling evidence of the ability of members to shape the directions of ASCD is available than the response to a demand by providing for 18 articles in a single year. Response to demand is apparent, yet also apparent is the responsibility of supervisors to provide continuous effort to have their needs met and not to rely on a crash program, for 1967 and 1968 are desolate years with reference to supervision. Yet, during these years, the problems of supervisors, nationally, were placing

---

*** Editor's Note: Two additional observations are relevant: (a) During the decade 1960-69 the Association has published one yearbook and six large booklets directly relating to the work of the supervisor or curriculum worker. (b) Most of the content of the journal and of the other publications of the Association strongly supports the insights, understandings, and expertise of the supervisor or curriculum worker.

them in probably the most critical status of any category of educators.

- What circumstances are responsible for what seemingly appears to be inadequate emphasis on the problems, concerns, and directions for supervision in an organization which claims to be "the professional home of supervisors"?

2. More than 50 percent of the articles included have been authored by staff members of colleges and universities. A review of the names listed as authors reveals that it is true that many have been supervisors, directors of instruction, or have held other positions directly related to supervision. As staff responsible for the preparation of supervisors, or the professional growth of supervisors who take advanced academic work, as university representatives in cooperative field projects with supervisors or schools, these writers have opportunities to understand the problems of supervision and thus write about them. However, the question is raised:

- Why are staff members of colleges and universities the chief spokesmen, through their writings, for supervisors and supervision when, except for some who supervise student teaching, they are not actually engaged in the practice of supervision?

3. Of the five categories of interests in supervision revealed in the 60 articles the subjects rank from highest to lowest in terms of number of articles published in the following order: the potential of supervision (17), leadership (15), the functions of supervisors on the job (13), professionalization (10), and research (5).

Emphasis on leadership is on its talent for growth, thus relating it very closely to the potential for supervision. When these two are combined it would seem that the authors reflect greater concern for the future of supervision than for professionalization of the supervisor and research, or the "why" of its current and future directions. This state of affairs represents a bit of an anomaly.

- How realistic are the directions described or predicted with so little regard for a research base?

The scarcity of research reports on supervision in *Educational Leadership* implies either a great lack of research, or failure to communicate its findings to the field worker and thereby provide important evidence needed in shaping supervisory roles and functions.

- What is the responsibility of ASCD, through its official magazine, for reporting research findings and assisting in interpreting the results of research in action?

4. Supervisors, themselves, are responsible for writing or coauthoring only 8 of the 60 articles. And their greatest interest apparently is in the future of supervision, with a total of 4 articles in this area. Research in action seems to be an unknown function and, similarly, the supervisor leaves to others reports and descriptions of the supervisor at work.

- Why is the supervisor leaving to others the important responsibilities of communicating through his official publication the nature of his job, the problems he is encountering, the success he is achieving?

The Why, How, and What of Supervision

Reviewing and analyzing the content of the 60 articles on supervision which appeared in *Educational Leadership* during the period 1960-68 is a fascinating experience. For one who began her academic preparation for supervision at a time when there was a single professional textbook available, popularly labeled "Burton's Bible," which, in harmony with its times, dealt almost exclusively with method and techniques, the step from the "there" of the 1930's to the "here" of the 1960's should be a giant step. Is it?

LEADERSHIP: TALENT FOR GROWTH

The 15 articles characterized by emphasis on leadership might well be labeled: "Humanizing Supervision." Dealing with the human dimensions of supervision, the writers are concerned with the personal qualities of the supervisor as leader, ranging from compassion and wisdom to self-effacement and love.

Common Threads. As a whole the articles emphasize several common threads:

1. That supervision is a team process which usually includes teacher, supervisor, and principal.
2. That supervision is a peer relationship with each member of the team assuming leadership, depending upon the situation and the appropriateness of the unique talents of each at a given time.
3. That the concept of the supervisor as a change agent is interpreted as a function which requires the creation of a supportive environment which frees the teacher to express creative attributes and talents conducive to teaching and learning. This concept is epitomized by one writer in the words of the poet, Kahlil Gibran:

> No man can reveal to you aught but that which already lies half asleep in the dawning of your own knowledge. . . .

> If he is wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind.
>
> The astronomer may speak to you of his understanding of space, but he cannot give you his understanding.
>
> The musician may sing to you of the rhythm which is in all space, but he cannot give you the ear which arrests the rhythm nor the voice which echoes it.
>
> And he who is versed in the science of numbers can tell of the region of weight and measure, but he cannot conduct you thither.
>
> For the vision of one man lends not its wings to another man. . . .[1]

Some "Positives" and Some "Negatives." The articles on supervision as leadership reflect some "positives" and some "negatives" from the point of view of the supervisor at work.

- Eight of the writers provide clear and understandable illustrations from practice related to the theory or concepts they are developing.
- Writers reflecting the most provocative theory or philosophy seldom illustrate; in other words, writers reflecting a high quality of thinking seldom use the technique of illustrating which is usually the best means of communicating to the supervisor in the field.
- Only one article is notable in its research base and this draws upon research outside the field of education which has implications for supervision as leadership.

Where Are We Going? In summary, the supervisor's leadership role advocated during the 1960's:

1. Places emphasis upon the person (the teacher) in the process of becoming, with the supervisor in the role of change agent, making it possible for the teacher to "become" whatever it is he is capable of becoming.
2. Describes the job qualifications of the supervisor in human terms: "understanding, appreciation, earned authority, love, knowledge, wisdom, thinking, enthusiasm, excellence, vision, freedom, attitude, feelings, interaction, self-concept."
3. Pays scant attention to the professional know-how needed by the supervisor. Although human and professional qualifications are not separate entities in the process of supervision in action, there are professional skills which are essential in effective human relations

---

[1] Reprinted from *The Prophet* by Kahlil Gibran with permission of the publisher, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright 1923 by Kahlil Gibran; renewal copyright 1951 by Administrators C.T.A. of Kahlil Gibran Estate, and Mary D. Gibran.

which a successful supervisor employs; that these skills are neglected is one of the weaknesses in the articles.

The ability to be effective in human relationships is not only a requisite but a "job security" factor for the supervisor. Leadership *for* supervisors, rather than leadership *by* supervisors, is revealed as a need in these articles. Such leadership may well listen to the supervisor who says, "I want to be the kind of human being you describe, with the attributes of wisdom, compassion, and others, but how do I become this kind of person? I want the skills of helping teachers to become the creative teachers they can be, but how do I prepare myself for this role?"

This supervisor who looks within must, as one writer has astutely pointed out,[2] often find himself in the same situation as Alice in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass*:

> Alice and the Queen had been running as fast as they could for some time. As they stopped to rest, Alice looked about in great surprise. She said, "Why, I do believe we've been under this tree the whole time! Everything's just as it was!"
>
> "Of course it is," said the Queen. "What would you have it?"
>
> "Well in 'our' country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else—if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing."
>
> "A slow sort of country!" said the Queen. "Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

For many supervisors, today, the Queen has ably defined their problem. They are asking, "Can I run twice as fast?" And more important, "Where am I going?" They look to their leaders for help in finding the answers. They cannot be found in these articles.

ISSUES IN PROFESSIONALIZATION

The titles of the 10 articles appearing in *Educational Leadership* on "Issues in Professionalization" reveal clearly the concerns of the writers with professionalization of supervisors. Three of these articles were written during 1961-62 and the last 7 during 1965-66.

What Constitutes Professional Status? With the exception of the Allen[3] article, the writers deal with the specific aspects of recruitment, preparation, continuing education of the supervisor, and certification. Most of the articles are descriptive reports of the status quo of supervision, of efforts in specific universities or states to deal with the problems of recruitment, to develop experimental preparation programs, or specific certification requirements. Two are reports of ASCD's plans to provide leadership in professionalization through its Committee on Professionalization of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers.

---

[2] Lillian I. Mosher. "The Supervisor Looks at the Principal." *Educational Leadership* 23 (8): 648-51; May 1966.

[3] Rowannetta S. Allen. "Role and Function of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers." *Educational Leadership* 23 (4): 330-33; January 1966.

Common Threads and Some Pertinent Questions. One of the problems reiterated throughout these 10 articles is the difficulty in defining the supervisor's role. This problem is apparently related to an earlier statement by Gordon Mackenzie which is quoted by two of the writers:

> Compounding the problem of identifying and clarifying the role of supervisors and curriculum workers are "the undeveloped state of the theory of the fields of supervision and of curriculum as well as the low levels of preparation of some supervisors and curriculum workers."

1. The lack of common agreement on roles and functions of supervisors, the lack of well developed descriptive theories as to the nature of supervision, would make it seem that efforts to establish recruitment and certification criteria, and to develop preparation programs, would be futile; that until research tackles the problems of roles and functions we are building castles in the air, which are floating about in a search for a firm theoretical foundation.

2. Another common thread is a bit of an anomaly. We do not know what the role and functions of the supervisor are, but we know they are changing. How do we know this except for the fact that "change" is the only "constant"?

3. Experimental programs described in the articles claim a reasonable success in accomplishing their goals. The evidence is not empirical, but rather judgmental.

Where Are We Going? With no clearly defined theoretical base for professionalization, the supervisor is affected by recent developments which compound the problem, for example:

- The increasing involvement of the federal government which is introducing new staff members with a variety of functions, formerly classified as supervisory.

- The involvement of the lay public in what was formerly classified as the internal concerns of the school.

2

In short, as Allen pointed out in 1966, the supervisor's confusion is centered in purpose, in who is qualified, and in how supervision should be accomplished.

The basic problem for ASCD has been, and continues to be, not emphasis upon *what is,* but coming to grips with researching the theory of supervision and, as Allen so clearly points out, creating what it takes to move supervision from the "emerging profession" status to a genuine profession:

> Professionalization implies the possession of a certain and particular know-how which can be brought to bear on problems. It implies concerted action to raise the level of practice within the profession and to maintain a mutually acceptable level of performance through policies enforced by the professional group. It implies selective admissions, specialized training in duly accredited institutions, and certification procedures approximating licensing.
>
> As we realize the urgency of the need for trained professional leadership in education and as we become more keenly aware of the unanswered problems which could be resolved if we, as a profession, took action, is it too much to hope that we may strengthen our efforts in that direction now?[4]

RESEARCH: INSTRUMENT FOR NEW KNOWLEDGE

A review and analysis of the 5 articles on research published during the 1960's is a dismal experience. In 1963 and again in 1965, Ben M. Harris and James Macdonald, through the monthly feature in *Educational Leadership,* "Research in Review," tell us that there is little to review. Macdonald reports that the 1965 ASCD Research Institutes were focused upon the concern: "Research and Development in Supervision," but that the institute planners were hard pressed to find research in supervision.

The 3 remaining articles are not on research, but on the need for research of a specific type, e.g., technical supervision, action research, thinking skills of teachers. Each author presents a rationale in support of his plan; two of the three articles discuss the role of the supervisor in getting *teachers* to engage in research.

Warning Signs:

1. Harris and Macdonald claim that our postures and positions on the roles and functions of the supervisor are essentially folklore, personal experience, philosophy, and psychology. This is not to discredit the contributions of each, but rather to highlight the fact that a professional worker, the supervisor, and a professional func-

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 333.

tion, supervision, have no sound, research-supported base of supervisory theory.

2. Macdonald provides the interesting information that supervisors themselves shy off from being the subjects of research, an anomaly, indeed, for those who claim professional status.

3. Harris reported in 1963 that *Education Index,* for the previous 10 years, listed only 36 articles on supervision per year, with not more than a single article on research for any one of these years. This suggests that in spite of the doctoral dissertations in the field of supervision, numbering some 20 in 1961, making some research findings available, a critical need was dissemination.

Where Are We Going? The established function of supervision for curriculum development and curriculum change, for in-service education and professional growth programs for teachers, for the improvement of learning remains, but new times are making new demands on supervisors for

Leadership

Liaison relations between school and community

Change in teacher behavior, with emphasis upon the function of planning

Human relations education

Stimulating action research by teachers.

Yet there is little research evidence to guide and support supervisors in developing "success-prone" plans, designs, and strategies for fulfilling their functions. Small wonder that supervisors suffer from confusion and are victimized by administrators who drop everything and anything in their laps.

- What is the role of ASCD in effecting a genuine professionalization of supervision?

- What is the role of ASCD in sensitizing supervisors to act in their own behalf in achieving professionalization?

THE SUPERVISOR AT WORK

The 13 articles classified in the category of "The Supervisor at Work" relate chiefly to the "nuts and bolts" of the job. They deal with the overt behavior of the supervisor, a phenomenon most easily observable by others, that is, by teachers, administrators, and college staff. Herein lie its dangers. That supervisors have left to others descriptions and interpretations of their work adds to the dangers. A review and analysis of the articles lead one to believe that the writers have concluded that what *is*, is what *ought* to be.

How Others See Supervisors at Work. Almost without exception the supervisor at work is depicted as the person who is Hell-bent on helping teachers, especially new teachers, whether the victims see these efforts as "help" or not. In fact, one writer goes so far as to tell supervisors that while teachers do not like supervisory visitation in the classroom, this feeling must simply be ignored.

In addition to classroom visitations, conferences, selecting books and materials, the use of media, the supervisor's relations with other staff members, in fact, all of the traditional activities associated with supervision are propounded with much emphasis on techniques.

There is equal emphasis on the need for the supervisor to possess fine human qualities which, by implication, make "service" to the teacher who, we are warned, often does not want it, more palatable. And we wonder at the rising teacher militancy, and we wonder even more at why it took so long to become a potent force in education, today.

Perhaps this reinforcement of a tradition centered in authority of the supervisor and dependence of the teacher is at the root of uneasiness manifested commonly by supervisors who hear on all sides that their new role is that of leader and change agent in setting new directions for education. They are faced with creating the "new" in educational leadership and, at the same time, are floundering in a context of void, resulting from failure to establish a professional theory and body of knowledge, characteristics of every other professional discipline. "Lambs to the slaughter, forward!" Every other professional discipline has had the resource of scholars and thinkers leading the way. Supervisors may well feel a disenchantment with their own leadership.

Where Are Supervisors Going? Supervisors are going into the unknown, unarmed, lacking even the five smooth stones of a David, facing a two-headed Goliath of public disenchantment with American education which is reaching a crisis state, and a professional house-divided, in which a successful teacher militancy is directed not only at administrators, but equally at supervisors.

- Can and will ASCD, the supervisor's professional organization, gird itself for an all-out effort to meet this critical need of its members?

- What will happen to ASCD's professional status if it does not?

SUPERVISION: ITS POTENTIAL

Reviewing and analyzing the 17 articles on the potential of supervision is as depressing as the feelings engendered while reading the previous section on the supervisor at work. These articles start out with an excellent historical review of the development of supervision. Moving from the emphasis on the inspection and quality control of the 1920's to the complex task of changing teaching and teachers of the 1930's, the reader senses that, like curriculum development, supervision has faced the future through the process of accretion, adding a bit here and there, but generally covering up the maintenance of the status quo through new names for old functions.

The impact of social change, beginning with World War II, the thrust of new political ideologies, the rise of automation and of technology, the injection of foundation sponsored educational programs, the shifting of the sources of curriculum change to the public and to scholars of the academic disciplines, and finally, the great racial revolution and the penetration by the federal government into local education in the interests of alleviating poverty, have generally resulted in the bypassing of supervisors in decision making and the overloading of supervisors as jacks-of-all-trades.

Do Words Make the Difference? A large number of the 17 articles sound like the replay of an old phonograph record. Replete with such terms as "democratic supervision, creative supervision, the creative personality, facilitators, change, peer relationships, communication, enthusiasm, cross-cultural communication," one has the feeling that never have so many words been used to say so little.

One writer claims with fervor that "supervision will never go back to inspection and demonstration," despite the reality experienced by teachers, many of whom would claim that supervision has never left outmoded techniques.

Where and How Will the Potential of Supervision Be Accomplished? Over the years, ASCD has put genuine effort into an action program to serve supervisors. Publications including booklets, a yearbook, and *Educational Leadership* have demonstrated spurts of energy that have been of some help. Many research institutes have been held and the Annual Conference of 1969 was focused on the supervisor and supervision.

The evidence which points to the inadequacy of effective change in the concept of supervision and its functions seems to point to two major weaknesses:

1. The failure of supervisors to accept the responsibility of leadership in creating their own profession.

2. The failure of scholars and researchers to provide a professional base for supervision through the development of a theory and a body of knowledge unique to supervision.

The implied threat of a secession by supervisors as a means of creating a professional home is a critical matter for ASCD as an organization. Yet this is a small matter in relation to the real problem, that of coming to grips with the professional growth of a group of educators who, with all of their shortcomings, have been the only group to devote a major share of their time to teachers and to curriculum development. That some assume the responsibilities as a top priority probably accounts for the achievement in quality of learning by teachers and children, small though such achievement may be in terms of aspiration for education.

Some Conclusions and Recommendations for Action

That supervisors are concerned about their professional status, that they are uneasy regarding their future, are well established facts.

That ASCD has long been concerned with the status of supervision, that it has been even more concerned over its failure to come to grips with the problem, in spite of some sporadic and deliberate efforts over a long period of time, are well established facts.

The 60 articles related to supervision, published in *Educational Leadership* during the period 1960-68, while not the only published materials provided by ASCD, or by other organizations, nevertheless have significance as probably the single largest resource provided by an organization whose major concerns are supervision and curriculum development.

Conclusions

Some conclusions and some recommendations are presented in this and in the following section.

1. The failure of leadership to achieve the professionalization

of supervision is a fact. This is the dominant conclusion of the analysis of the articles.

2. The failure of supervisors to take the initiative in professionalization of their own specialty is supported by the following findings:

- There is little evidence that supervisors assume anything but a passive role in efforts to secure a professional status.
- Supervisors tend not to write on subjects of concern to them, one of the best means of communicating to their colleagues the concerns, the problems, the needs, and the successes they have.
- Supervisors tend to let others, usually not active in their field, speak for them; particularly staff members in colleges and universities.

3. Scholars, thinkers, and researchers in the field of supervision have tended to avoid the task of establishing a theory of supervision and of identifying a body of knowledge pertinent to the field of supervision.

- The findings of the relatively small amount of research available are seldom disseminated among professional educators or communicated to supervisors.

Thus, those who are looked upon by supervisors as a source of leadership share in the failure.

4. ASCD has failed in a number of ways to assume its rightful role of leadership.

- The Publications Committee and the Executive Committee, chiefly responsible for the themes and emphases in *Educational Leadership*, have not been as diligent as they should have been in keeping supervision, one of the two foci of ASCD, in the forefront.
- ASCD's Committees, Councils, and Commissions and its Board of Directors have not met their responsibility, as fully as possible, for the development and promotion of supervision as a professional discipline.
- Local and state affiliates have generally been remiss in developing programs which focus upon supervision as a professional discipline.
- Supervisors, as members of ASCD, have only in recent years taken the leadership, through the Committee on Supervision, in being heard in their own organization and have presented demands to make ASCD fulfill its responsibility of becoming truly the profes-

sional home needed by supervisors. This effort has not been consistent, however. Sporadic, crash efforts do not have holding power.

Priorities for Action

Recommendations which conclude this report are based on what appear to me to be top priorities for action by ASCD.

1. Leadership must be provided for supervisors in uniting and preparing to achieve welfare goals and professionalization through recruitment, selection, preparation, and certification. Supervisors must be helped to achieve their potential for competent, concerted action in getting their own house in order.

2. The supervisors' tendency to take what comes, to let others speak and act for them, places them in a position comparable to teachers of the 1920's. Today, supervisors are truly the disadvantaged among all professional educators. Changing apathy to action is the first order of business.

3. Research sponsored by ASCD must produce answers to some long asked questions:

- What *is* the current status of the roles and functions of supervisors, nationally, as they go about their work?
- What changes in supervisory roles and functions are occurring and why?
- Within the matrix of knowledge about the processes of learning, about the preparation of teachers, about the effectiveness of teaching or the quality of learning, about the social, political, and economic knowledges, attitudes, and skills needed by children and youth preparing for adult participation in the life and development of the nation during the 1970's, *the development of a theory of supervision, without which supervisors are helpless in providing the expected leadership, can no longer be avoided.* We have drifted too long talking about these things; only action carries a survival insurance for supervisors, and, perhaps, for the schools of the nation.
- A final priority for research relates to the identification of factors, processes, and skills needed by supervisors in the art of effective communication to the profession and to the public.

Recommendations

Accordingly, as President of ASCD, 1968-69, I recommend:

1. That the Board of Directors, during the post-Conference Session in Chicago 1969, take official action to assure a concentrated

effort to create ways and means to fulfill ASCD's responsibilities for professionalization of supervision.

2. That the Research Council accept the responsibility to develop plans for the studies recommended under "Priorities for Action," which will result in the establishment of a theory and body of knowledge pertinent to professional supervision. Consideration should be given to establishing a jointly sponsored project between ASCD and one or more local school systems to develop models.

3. That the Associate Secretary responsible for liaison with local and affiliate units gear his efforts to stimulating and assisting these units in the development of studies of supervision appropriate to local situations.

4. That the Executive Secretary designate an Associate Secretary, either through realignment of present functions or the appointment of an additional Associate Secretary, to take responsibility for service to supervisors, much as is presently provided for services to state affiliates. This staff member would provide not only leadership and service to supervisors, but would, in an important sense, act as a watchdog over a trust.

My personal conviction is that supervisors are the only staff members of many school systems whose energies are concentrated on helping teachers and improving learning; that supervisors have a wealth of potential for stimulating improvement in learning; and that they are being sold short by lack of effective leadership.

The New Supervisor

The "new supervisor" of the future has a powerful resource to build upon, that of the present supervisor who has demonstrated qualities of caring and coping.

Concepts Implicit in Generating New Understandings and New Functions

In "becoming" the new supervisor, who acts on a firm base of theory and the authority of knowledge, a content framework for development has been provided. In "The Plan for Study and Action" for the 1970's, proposed by the Executive Committee of ASCD and adopted by the Board of Directors during the 1969 Conference, the generation and implementation of new understandings to meet new demands are organized under three powerful and pervasive concepts: *relevance, accountability,* and *modifiability.* A plan of action to professionalize supervision must be built upon these concepts.

Yet this is not enough. While the new supervisor must be in command of the day to day, "nuts and bolts" of his new functions, he will be motivated by the larger goals of education in a democracy. He will see:

1. The supervisor as keeper of the dream, the American dream of human dignity and brotherhood.

2. The supervisor as catalyst of the American scene, perceiving change, weighing its implications for education, providing leadership in planning to meet it.

3. The supervisor as realist, accepting the fact that, like the gnarled and twisted pines on the rugged, windswept coast of Japan, the ability to bend with the wind means survival, while the mighty oak, rigid and inflexible, crashes to the earth, helpless against a force greater than itself.

The "new supervision" must never perceive itself as a "power play," for, as Paul Fournier has written,

> It is a catastrophe when evil triumphs, but it is an even greater catastrophe if it compels the just to resort to injustice in order to combat it. Unless the world returns to moral conscience, to the value of the spirit and to its primacy over force, power is only a source of destruction.

Contributors

Harry S. Broudy
Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana

Muriel Crosby
Consultant on Urban Education, Wilmington, Delaware, and President, ASCD, 1968-69

Richard L. Foster
Superintendent, Berkeley Unified School District, Berkeley, California

Alexander Frazier
Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, and President, ASCD, 1969-70

Jacqueline Grennan Wexler
President, Webster College, Webster Groves, Missouri

ASCD Publications

(The NEA stock number appears in parentheses after each title.)

Yearbooks

Balance in the Curriculum (610-17274)	$4.00
Evaluation as Feedback and Guide (610-17700)	$6.50
Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools (610-17256)	$3.00
Guidance in the Curriculum (610-17266)	$3.75
Individualizing Instruction (610-17264)	$4.00
Leadership for Improving Instruction (610-17454)	$3.75
Learning and Mental Health in the School (610-17674)	$5.00
Learning and the Teacher (610-17270)	$3.75
Life Skills in School and Society (610-17786)	$5.50
New Insights and the Curriculum (610-17548)	$5.00
Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education (610-17278)	$4.50
Research for Curriculum Improvement (610-17268)	$4.00
Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director (610-17624)	$4.50
Youth Education: Problems, Perspectives, Promises (610-17746)	$5.50

Booklets

Assessing and Using Curriculum Content (611-17662)	$1.00
Better Than Rating (611-17298)	$1.25
Changing Curriculum Content (611-17600)	$1.00
The Changing Curriculum: Mathematics (611-17724)	$2.00
The Changing Curriculum: Modern Foreign Languages (611-17764)	$2.00
The Changing Curriculum: Science (611-17704)	$1.50
Children's Social Learning (611-17326)	$1.75
Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction (611-17728)	$1.00
Criteria for Theories of Instruction (611-17756)	$2.00
Curriculum Change: Direction and Process (611-17698)	$2.00
Curriculum Decisions ⟷ Social Realities (611-17770)	$2.75
A Curriculum for Children (611-17790)	$2.75
Curriculum Materials 1969 (611-17784)	$2.00
Discipline for Today's Children and Youth (611-17314)	$1.00
Early Childhood Education Today (611-17766)	$2.00
Educating the Children of the Poor (611-17762)	$2.00
Elementary School Mathematics: A Guide to Current Research (611-17752)	$2.75
Elementary School Science: A Guide to Current Research (611-17726)	$2.25
The Elementary School We Need (611-17636)	$1.25
Extending the School Year (611-17340)	$1.25
Freeing Capacity To Learn (611-17322)	$1.00
Guidelines for Elementary Social Studies (611-17738)	$1.50
The High School We Need (611-17312)	$ .50
Human Variability and Learning (611-17332)	$1.50
The Humanities and the Curriculum (611-17708)	$2.00
Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process (611-17722)	$2.25
Humanizing the Secondary School (611-17780)	$2.75
Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research (611-17560)	$2.75
Influences in Curriculum Change (611-17730)	$2.25
Intellectual Development: Another Look (611-17618)	$1.75
The Junior High School We Need (611-17338)	$1.00
The Junior High School We Saw (611-17604)	$1.50
Juvenile Delinquency (611-17306)	$1.00
Language and Meaning (611-17696)	$2.75
Learning More About Learning (611-17310)	$1.00
Linguistics and the Classroom Teacher (611-17720)	$2.75
New Curriculum Developments (611-17664)	$1.75
New Dimensions in Learning (611-17336)	$1.50
The New Elementary School (611-17734)	$2.50
Nurturing Individual Potential (611-17606)	$1.50
Personalized Supervision (611-17680)	$1.75
Strategy for Curriculum Change (611-17666)	$1.25
Supervision in Action (611-17346)	$1.25
Supervision: Emerging Profession (611-17796)	$5.00
Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions (611-17732)	$2.00
The Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching (611-17702)	$3.25
The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions (611-17782)	$2.50
The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation (611-17798)	$ .75
Theories of Instruction (611-17668)	$2.00
Toward Professional Maturity (611-17740)	$1.50
What Are the Sources of the Curriculum? (611-17522)	$1.50
Child Growth Chart (618-17442)	$ .25

Discounts on quantity orders of same title to single address: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%. Orders for $2 or less must be accompanied by remittance. Postage and handling will be charged on all orders not accompanied by payment. The NEA stock number of each publication must be listed when ordering.

Subscription to Educational Leadership—$6.50 a year. ASCD Membership dues: regular (subscription and yearbook)—$20.00 a year; Comprehensive (includes subscription and yearbook plus other publications issued during period of the membership)—$30.00 a year.

Order from: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

66/67